DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 259 HE 006 160

AUTHOR	Davis, Junius A.; Batchelor, Steve A.
TITLE	The Effective College and University Board: A Report of a National Survey of Trustees and Presidents. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Research Triangle Inst., Durham, N.C. Center for Educational Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	RTI-Project-22T-905
PUB DATE	30 Aug 74
NOTE	108p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 720, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Problems; Educational Administration; *Governing Boards; *Higher Education; *Presidents; Questionnaires; Statistical Data; *Surveys; *Trustees

ABSTRACT

This study reveals significant contrasts between the perceptions of college presidents and trustees with regard to the structural and procedural characteristics of governing boards. Highlights of the report include: (1) Presidents and trustees generally agreed among themselves on characteristics perceived as negatively affecting governing board functioning, with the following three factors cited most frequently: member inexperience, understanding how a board should function, and too much time devoted to trivia. (2) Most presidents and trustees felt that more attention to long range concerns and better orientation for board members to the institution would improve board functioning. (3) More than half of the presidents rated leadership skills, community stature, and knowledgeability on higher education issues as the characteristics they believed to be most important in trustee selection. (4) The presidents and trustees of private liberal arts colleges, private universities, and public universities rated their boards as highly effective most frequently: presidents and trustees of state colleges, private junior colleges, and private black institutions tended to give their boards lower ratings. (5) The majority of presidents rated fiscal planning as the most important challenge to governing boards in the next decade. Appendixes include the elaboration of procedures employed in the survey, and comments on bias; the survey questionnaires used with trustees and presidents; and the colleges and universities, by type and membership status, included in the survey. (Author/PG)

RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

RTI Project No. 22T-905

30 August 1974

FINAL REPORT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY BOARD: A REPORT OF A NATIONAL SURVEY OF TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENTS

Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges
One Dupont Circle, Suite 720
Washington, D. C. 20036

(202) 296-8400

Additional copies $5.00 each prepaid

Junius A. Davis
Steve A. Batchelor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NORTH CAROLINA 27709

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	A. Objectives of the Survey	1
	B. The Particular Limitations and Advantages of the Survey Procedure	2
	C. What This Report Contains	3
II.	PROCEDURE	4
	A. The Construction and Content of the Survey Questionnaire	4
	B. The Distribution of the Questionnaires, and the Response	4
	C. Some Particular Cautions that Should Be Applied in Judging the Data that Follow	6
III.	FINDINGS: A DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO DIFFERENCES AMONG BOARDS OF DIFFERENT KINDS OF INSTITUTIONS	9
	A. Board Composition	9
	B. The Functioning of the Boards	17
	C. The Effectiveness of the Boards	34
	D. Changes in Boards Perceived as Leading to Improvement of Board Functioning	43
	E. Challenges Perceived by the Presidents in the Decade Ahead	45
	F. Informational and Service Needs of Presidents and Board Members	48
	G. Summary of Differences Between Presidents and Trustees in Perceptions of Their Boards	52
IV.	FINDINGS: FACTORS RELATED TO PERCEPTIONS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS	55
	A. The Structure or Definition of Board Effectiveness	55
	B. Relationships between Board Structural Characteristics and Effectiveness of Boards	57
	C. Relationships between Decisionmaking Styles and Effectiveness of Boards	59
	D. Relationships between the Kinds of Problems Boards Experience and Ratings of Board Effectiveness	59
	E. Relationships between Information or Service Needs of Boards and Board Effectiveness Ratings	62
	F. Relationships between Challenges the Future is Perceived to Hold and Board Effectiveness	64

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

		Page
G.	Relationship between Presidents' Perception of Personal Support from Board and his Rating of Board Effectiveness	67
H.	Relationship between Trustee Selection Practices and Board Effectiveness	67
I.	Limitations of the Study of Factors Related to Board Effectiveness	70
J.	Summary of the Analysis of Board Effectiveness	70

Appendix A: Elaboration of Procedures Employed in the Survey, and Comments on Bias

Appendix B: The Survey Questionnaires Used with Trustees and Presidents

Appendix C: Colleges and Universities, by Type and AGB Membership Status, Included in the Survey

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Summary of Content of Presidents' and Trustees' Questionnaire	5
2	Numbers of Institutions, Presidents, and Trustees Surveyed and Responding	7
3	Percentages of Presidents Ascribing Central Influence and Importance to Selected Forces in a Selection of New Trustees	10
4	Percentages of Responding Trustees, by Institution Type Served, of Various Length of Trustee Service	14
5	Percentages of Responding Trustees of Various Ages, by Institution Type	15
6	Sex and Race of the Responding Trustees	16
7	Percentages of Presidents Reporting Various Frequencies of Board Meetings per Year, by Institutional Type	18
8	Percentages Found by Hartnett (1967-68) of Trustees Reporting Selected Frequencies of Board Meetings	19
9	Percentages of Trustees Reporting Various Numbers of Days per Month Devoted to Trusteeship	21
10	Percentages of Presidents, by Institution Type, Reporting Trustee Attendance at Board Meetings as "Excellent"	22
11	Percentages of Trustees and Presidents Reporting "Considerable Influence" of Selected Factors in Decisionmaking	23
12	Percentages of Presidents and Trustees Stated Selected Factors Affected Their Boards Adversely to a Moderate or a Considerable Extent	29
13	Percentages of Presidents Reporting Board Members as "Very Helpful" in Selected Areas	33
14	Percentages of Presidents and Trustees Reporting Different Modes of Involvement in Formulation of Long Range Plan	35
15	Percentages of Presidents and Trustees Who are "Quite Satisfied" or "Quite Concerned" about the Reasonableness of Their Long Range Plan	36
16	Percentages of Presidents and Trustees Rating Selected Dimensions of Board Effectiveness in the Highest Category	39
17	Identification of Institutional Subgroups of Respondents Who (1) Most Frequently or (2) Least Frequently Evaluated Selected Board Qualities as "Excellent"	41

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
18	Percentages of Presidents and Trustees Indicating Selected Changes that Would Improve Board Functioning	44
19	Percentages of Presidents Assigning "Of Greatest Importance" to Selected Challenges Facing Governing Boards	46
20	Percentages of Presidents and Trustees Rating Various Kinds of Information as "Extremely Valuable"	49
21	Percentages of Presidents and Trustees Finding Various Service Activities Very Attractive	50
22	Intercorrelations Among Various "Dimensions" of Board Effectiveness from Ratings by Trustees (N=1315) and Presidents (N=165)	56
23	Relationship of Board Effectiveness Ratings to Selected Structural Characteristics as Reported by Presidents and Trustees	58
24	Relationships Between Board Effectiveness Ratings and Decisionmaking Process	60
25	Relationships Between Board Effectiveness Ratings and Adverse Factors Affecting Board Functioning	61
26	Relationships Between Board Effectiveness Ratings and Changes in Board Felt Desirable	63
27	Relationships Between Ratings of Board Effectiveness and (1) Informational Needs and (2) Desirable Service Activities	65
28	Relationships Between President's Perception of Board Effectiveness and Importance Ascribed to Particular Challenges Facing Governing Boards	66
29	Relationships Between Board Effectiveness Ratings by President and His Perception of Kind and Extent of Support Received from His Board	68
30	Relationships Between Board Effectiveness Ratings by President and His Perception of (1) Factors Influencing Selection of New Trustees and (2) Degree to which Factors Should be Operative	69

The Effective College and University Board: A Report of a National Survey of Trustees and Presidents

I. THE PROBLEM

A. Objectives of the Survey

There are many opinions, drawn from observation or personal experience, as to the nature of an effective college or university board, and as to how it should discharge its responsibilities. Yet, exact knowledge of how these boards actually function, and of what forces are most critical in assuring effective functioning, is not available. With one eye on the service role of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) in stimulating trustees and regents and in providing a sense of context for their work, and the other on the new challenges prompted by the changing social and institutional contexts, the Commission on the Future of AGB last year embarked on a series of inquiries designed to yield better informed perspectives of what constitutes an effective board, and how effectiveness of functioning might be best assured in the future.

One activity within this series of inquiries was the survey of representative boards (and the associated presidents or chancellors) of American institutions of higher education, grouped as follows: (1) public community colleges, (2) public four-year colleges; (3) large public universities; (4) private junior colleges; (5) private traditionally black institutions; (6) private liberal arts colleges; and (7) private universities. (The nature of these groups is best attested by the lists of institutions involved in the survey, which is given as Appendix C to this report.) The survey employed questionnaires (copies provided as Appendix B) to be directed to trustees and to presidents that would (1) obtain the respondent's (a president or a trustee) perception or evaluation of how effectively his board was functioning; and (2) examine a number of aspects of board characteristics, style of functioning, and trustee needs that may be associated with board effectiveness, as reported by the respondent. The major objective of the survey was to determine from the respondent's experience what structural or procedural characteristics are associated with his perception of the board as effective; a related objective was to provide a detailed inventory, by boards grouped into the seven institutional categories, of how perceptions differ among presidents and trustees according to the type of institution

served. The overriding purpose was to gain insights that might be useful in improving the effectiveness of boards in their governance of higher education.

B. The Particular Limitations and Advantages of the Survey Procedure

The limitations of questionnaire surveys are well known. Chief among these is that they generally impose a pre-conceived structure on the respondent, making it difficult for him to describe a complex and dynamic or subtle situation in terms of alternatives presented. There can be little provision for qualifiers that the respondent would like to add. Also, the respondent can only report what he observes and believes, and any group of respondents will contain individuals with a wide range of insights, vested interests, and biases.

Yet, the questionnaire survey approach permits an efficient inventory of a large number and range of observers or participants; it also presents a uniform, standardized context for directing thinking to a discrete set of factors. As such, if generalizations from results are drawn in proper perspective and with appropriate caution, it can add different dimensions to logical analyses or in-depth examinations that the other activities in the total AGB inquiry have produced.

Two essential research strategies were used in examining the questionnaire survey data. First: one may view the individuals deeply involved in board activities--the institution presidents and the board members--as constituting a large pool of experts whose observations, ideas, and reports, systematically collected and inventoried, have intrinsic merit. Second, and toward yielding a deeper level of insight into the basic question: one may search for associations among different observations that the reporter may or may not be aware of. For example--what differences are reported in decisionmaking strategies by those who rate their boards highly effective as opposed to those who rate their boards highly ineffective? What are the different strengths of relationships between satisfaction with board functioning on one hand, and on the other hand, such factors as firm leadership by the board chairman, or adequacy of information provided by the president, or employment of a committee structure?

C. What This Report Contains

The summary report that follows is, in effect, an abstract of some of the highlights of the findings from the survey. Following a brief description of procedures (section II) these findings will be presented in two parts. First, an inventory and summary of the observations and opinions of the respondents will be presented, with particular attention to differences found among respondents from the seven categories of institutions; a brief examination of differences between the presidents' perceptions and those of trustees will also be presented (section III). Second, some of the interrelationships among effectiveness ratings and other reported intrinsic or extrinsic board characteristics will be examined (section IV).

It should be noted, in passing, that the analyses reported do not in any sense exhaust the list of reasonable questions that may be imposed on the data. Sharp differences in opinion, for example, may be expected as a function of age, or length of service of the trustee, or of other variables. Also, a more valid characterization of board effectiveness might be obtained by pooling the responses of respondents according to the institution they represent (indeed, agreement among trustees of a given board, or lack of it, in reporting on a particular board or president may signal an important board characteristic for present purposes!). Another useful addition to the analyses reported herein would be the imposition of an outside criterion of board effectiveness--such as institutional growth, or fiscal stability, or goal attainment over time (the criterion of effectiveness employed in the questionnaire is essentially that of the respondents' subjective judgment). Also, it should be noted that the questionnaires contained a number of opportunities for open-end or free response; in some instances, answers appear worthy of detailed consideration and summarization. Such questions as these are left for future analyses by AGB or others.

II. PROCEDURE

A somewhat more detailed description of the procedures employed in this survey is provided in Appendix A to this report. As a backdrop for a thoughtful consideration of the findings to be presented, however, some aspects of the mechanics of the survey are crucial.

A. The Construction and Content of the Survey Questionnaire

Two questionnaires, with some overlapping content, were employed: one for institution presidents, and one for trustees. Their construction was a joint product of the professional staff of the Center for Educational Research and Evaluation of the Research Triangle Institute, the AGB professional staff, and the AGB Commission study director, Dr. John W. Nason. Specific content areas believed to be critical were first drawn from the general statement of the study's purposes; a host of items reflecting these content areas were created; and, draft instruments were pilot tested using the AGB Board and Commission on the Future, and the AGB Council of Presidents, as critical respondents.

The developed questionnaires are provided as Appendix B of this report. In brief, their content included the kinds of questions indicated in Table 1.

B. The Distribution of the Questionnaires, and the Response

Lists of institutions in the seven institutional categories were assembled; a random selection of institutions within each group was drawn. To these randomly selected groups, other institutions were added at the insistence of the AGB staff and study director, so that the composite might conform more nearly to what institutions they felt were appropriate representatives of the category. (Thus, it is not safe to generalize from the data on a particular class of institution to all institutions in that category as defined, for example, by the U. S. Office of Education.) It may be assumed that the non-random institutions added to the randomly selected portion are generally of higher visibility than many represented in a random selection. There are technical reasons for believing that use of the non-random members (through restriction of range of responses from that that would be obtained had the visible institutions not been added) will produce conservative estimates of relationships among the responses.

Table 1

SUMMARY OF CONTENT OF PRESIDENTS' AND TRUSTEES' QUESTIONNAIRE

Item	President Questionnaire	Trustee Questionnaire
Ratings of board effectiveness on a variety of dimensions	✓	✓
Factors adversely affecting board functioning	✓	✓
Decisionmaking strategies and procedures	✓	✓
Presence or absence of long range plan	✓	✓
Structural changes or new procedures to improve board effectiveness	✓	✓
Informational and service needs	✓	✓
Year of appointment	✓	✓
Age	✓	✓
Sex	✓	✓
Race	X	✓
Time devoted to trusteeship	X	✓
Frequency of board meetings	✓	X
Attendance at board meetings	✓	X
Non-board members of board committees	✓	X
Factors in the selection of new trustees	✓	X
Limitations on terms of trustee service	✓	X
Kind and extent of trustee support for president	✓	X
Importance of a variety of future challenges facing governing boards	✓	X
"Crises" experienced and board handling	X	✓

For descriptive purposes, however, a more positive picture may be produced than would otherwise be the case.[1/] Lists of the institutions approached in the survey, by type and whether they were AGB member institutions or not, are provided in Appendix C.

The numbers of institutions surveyed and of respondents, by institutional category, are provided in Table 2. In this connection, it should be added that, for each institution in the sample, the president, the board chairman (if such existed), and all trustees were queried, unless in the latter instance trustees on a given board numbered more than 20, in which case a random selection of 20 trustees was made from lists of record.

It should be noted that public institutions with multi-campus governing and/or coordinating boards were generally excluded. Pretest activities left little doubt that the developed questionnaires were simply not relevant for the particular roles of, and forces affecting, these kinds of boards.

The survey questionnaires were mailed in November 1973; there was one follow-up of nonrespondents in mid-December 1973. Questionnaires returned by 15 February 1974 were employed in the data analyses. These represented 188 presidents and 1,581 trustees (including 31 board chairmen), of which 186 and 1495 respectively produced responses sufficiently complete to be usable.

C. Some Particular Cautions that Should Be Applied in Judging the Data that Follow

There are several constraints on the data produced by the survey, beyond those already noted, that should be kept in mind in speculating on the implications of particular findings. First, the numbers of presidents, particularly when subdivided into the seven institutional groups, are quite small, and therefore cannot as reliably be considered to represent all related presidents. For example, only 14 presidents of black private colleges responded; any one reporting a particular way constitutes about seven percent of the total. The larger numbers of trustees responding produces more reliable and stable distributions of responses.

1/ Some examination of differences between the random and non-random portions of each institutional group were made, and are reported in Appendix A. In general, there appear to be few differences between the two portions in most instances.

Table 2

NUMBERS OF INSTITUTIONS, PRESIDENTS, AND TRUSTEES SURVEYED AND RESPONDING

	Institution Type							
	1 Public Community College	2 Private Junior College	3 Black	4 Private Liberal Arts	5 State College	6 Private University	7 Public University	Total
Number of Institutions Surveyed	54	30	28	57	43	37	33	282
Number of Presidents Responding	37	15	14	34	22	24	30	186
Percent of Total Surveyed who Responded	69%	50%	50%	77%	51%	65%	91%	66%
Number of Trustees Surveyed	415	505	517	1079	358	789	388	4051
Number of Trustees Responding	175	196	148	464	122	243	147	1495
Percent of Total Surveyed who Responded	42%	39%	29%	43%	34%	31%	38%	37%

Second: as the data on returns in Table 2 show, substantial portions of those asked to respond to the survey did not respond. As board effectiveness was an obvious target, and as some questions were relatively personal (e.g., support of president by board members), it is unreasonable to assume that the respondents represent the samples of individuals surveyed. The degree of bias from this source is unknown; it is likely that a more positive picture is provided than would be the case had all individuals surveyed responded.

Third: the content of the questionnaires is not equally applicable to the seven different institutional categories. Some relevant questions for typical public institution boards, for example, do not appear.

Fourth: all responding presidents and all responding trustees were included in the data analysis; trustee respondents whose presidents did not respond may be included, so that the comparisons of presidents' and trustees' perceptions are not necessarily equally based on the institutional contexts reflected. Still another problem of this sort applies to the total response pattern presented: the presidents or trustees in the sample do not represent a random cross-section of American higher education because the numbers of institutions contacted in each institutional category were not proportional to the number of institutions of that kind available.

Fifth: the data representing state colleges and public universities should be highly suspect because an attempt was made to exclude those public institutions with multi-campus or multi-institution governing boards. This action was taken because the pretest revealed a frequent judgment that the survey content proposed was simply not relevant to the multi-campus board, and that not enough is known about the differences from one state to another to be assured that a relevant questionnaire could be constructed. For example, only thirteen states are represented in the state college group; also, given the trend to multi-campus boards, this is probably a non-representative group.

III. FINDINGS: A DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO DIFFERENCES AMONG BOARDS OF DIFFERENT KINDS OF INSTITUTIONS

A. Board Composition

The survey questionnaire did not explore in any exhaustive way the composition of the boards; this has been better accomplished in other surveys.[2/] However, certain aspects of the board structure were felt to be potentially relevant to the central purposes of the survey, and were examined through either the presidents' or the trustees' questionnaires.

1. Factors in the Selection of Trustees

Presidents were asked to report how strongly a number of different forces appeared to operate in the actual selection or appointment of new trustees; they were also asked to judge how important each of these forces should be. For the total group of respondents, the proportions rating each force or factor as of central influence are given in Table 3, together with the proportions stating that each factor should be of central importance.

A prime generalization from the findings presented in Table 3 is that although for some of the forces the actual influence is rated about as strongly as the force is believed to warrant (e.g., presidential, board chairman, or board member advice; constituent representation; professional competency; past institutional affiliation), there are other forces that the presidents believe should be substantially more influential than they perceive to be the case. These are: leadership skills, knowledgeability on higher education issues, fund raising capability, and community stature. A corollary observation is the different rank order found between actual influence and the importance the respondent felt the particular procedure should have: for example, knowledgeability on higher education issues is believed to be of central

---

2/ For example, see Hartnett, R. T. College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds and Educational Attitudes. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969; or Rauh, M. A. The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

PERCENTAGES OF PRESIDENTS ASCRIBING CENTRAL INFLUENCE AND IMPORTANCE TO SELECTED FORCES IN THE SELECTION OF NEW TRUSTEES

Type	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Private Black		Total	
	Influence	Importance	Influence	Importance	Influence	Importance	Influence	Importance	Influence	Importance	Influence	Importance	Influence	Importance	Influence	Importance
Community stature (of prospect)	62%	82%	41%	57%	28%	56%	43%	46%	43%	67%	64%	61%	57%	71%	48%	65%
Advice of president	7	10	14	9	3	7	42	38	68	65	58	58	64	79	37	38
Leadership skills	27	67	36	81	15	76	21	69	39	76	54	71	64	71	35	73
Advice of board members	20	22	19	24	7	3	57	54	46	46	42	42	62	54	33	33
Representation of different constituencies	38	26	18	33	38	41	21	38	40	45	9	21	50	64	32	37
Advice of board chairman	10	13	10	14	10	7	29	31	50	42	50	39	43	36	29	26
Competence in a professional specialty	9	16	9	19	7	0	29	38	23	37	22	25	36	57	17	25
Fund raising capability	3	6	4	20	0	4	21	85	23	58	30	56	43	79	16	39
Past affiliation with institution	11	9	14	14	17	15	14	8	20	16	25	17	0	0	16	13
Knowledgeability on higher education issues	15	62	19	48	3	56	28	62	7	46	8	38	36	71	13	53

importance as a selection criterion by more than half of the presidents, making it the third most important (after leadership skills and community stature) among the ten forces--yet, it ranks tenth in perceived actual influence. About three-fourths of the presidents believe leadership skills should be of central importance (against a proportion of about one-third believing it is of central influence), and about two thirds feel community stature should be of central importance (against one-half believing it to be of central influence).

When the responses of subgroups of presidents of the different kinds of institutions were contrasted, no significant differences among the subgroups in influence of the forces were found for the community stature, constituency representation, and professional competency forces. However, the public college and university presidents stand out as seeing their advice of more limited influence in trustee selection than do the private (and black) institution presidents; similar patterns hold for advice of chairman or of board members as a force. Traditional methods of election or appointment of public institution trustees obviously and inevitably restricts some influences that affect trustee selection at private institutions. This contrast is most marked in the comparison between influence of presidential advice by public university presidents versus private liberal arts college presidents: three percent of the former, against 68 percent of the latter, see their advice as of central influence. Ratings of the importance that these sources of advice should have generally parallel the influence ratings (see Table 3).

As would be expected, a similar difference between the public versus the private institution presidents exists on fund-raising capability as an influence in trustee selection. None of the public university presidents, three percent of the community college presidents, and four percent of the state college presidents see this quality as of central influence, against percentages ranging from 21 percent (for the private junior college presidents) to 43 percent (for the predominantly black private institution presidents). Incidentally, 85 percent of the private junior college presidents and 79 percent of the black institution presidents felt fund raising capability to be of central importance.

Leadership skills is ranked as a central influence in trustee selection by 64 percent of the black institution presidents and by 54 percent of the other private university presidents. It is least frequently so

ranked by the two groups of two-year college presidents (27 percent of community college presidents, and 21 percent of private junior college presidents), and by the public university presidents (where 15 percent rank this as of central influence). Past affiliation with the institution was rated a central influence by none of the black institution presidents, but by 20 percent and 25 percent of the private liberal arts and private university presidents respectively; the public and two-year institutions fall between these extremes. Knowledgeability on higher education issues, which will be recalled as a factor believed to be much more important in principle than influential in practice, is perceived as centrally influential by 36 percent of the black institution presidents and 28 percent of the private junior college presidents, against, at the other extreme, only 3 percent of the public university presidents, and 7 percent and 8 percent respectively of the private college or private university presidents. The difference between influence and importance ratings here is most marked for public university presidents, where 18 times as many presidents (or 56 percent) felt that knowledgeability was important than felt it influential in selection.

The presidents of the private black institutions stand out from the other institution presidents in rating all but one (past affiliation with the institution) of the ten forces of central influence and of central importance more frequently than do the total group of presidents. This would suggest that a greater variety of factors affect (and are felt should affect) trustee selection at black institutions, or that greater restrictions exist on the other institutional groups in how trustees are appointed or selected.

The findings in this regard are difficult to summarize adequately. Some forces seem to be a function of the public versus private institution situation. Others seem to be most precisely a function of whether the institution is a two-year or four-year institution, or is a university. It would seem that the presidents of public institutions generally see any of the forces less frequently of central influence than do their private institution counterparts, which, most likely, suggests merely that selection or appointment is more a matter of prevailing practice and procedure, legislatively imposed, than of the application of criteria intrinsic to the board or institution.

2. Limitations on Service as a Trustee

Differences in limitations existing on terms of service of board members, when examined across the seven institutional groups, appear to be a function solely of a different practice by community colleges when contrasted to all other institutional groups combined. About half of the community college presidents, against about four-fifths of the others, report restrictions on terms of service. Opinion as to whether restrictions should exist parallel actuality closely, with the possible exception that about 14 percent more of the presidents for the black institutions and the private liberal arts colleges believe that restrictions should exist than report that restrictions do exist.

3. Age of Trustees and Length of Service

Data on the year elected or appointed as trustee for some 1,500 responding trustees are shown in Table 4, where the proportions in each date category are shown by institutional type. In general, private (including black) institutions tend to have a larger proportion of trustees with extended terms of service than do the public institutions, but the differences (while statistically significant) are not marked.

The age of the responding trustees by institutional type is shown in Table 5. The oldest group is clearly that respresenting the black institutions, where almost two-thirds are 56 years of age or older.

4. Sex and Race of the Responding Trustees

The sex and race of the respondent group, by institutional type, are shown in Table 6. These data are straightforward and require little elaborative comment, except to note, first, that the large private university and the community college appear to lag somewhat in the addition of women to their boards. Second: although the proportions of black trustees in the various predominantly white institutional groups are up slightly from 1967 as found by Hartnett,[3/] only the state college appears to have made much headway in adding blacks to its board. The private liberal arts and private university groups show only 2 percent black, and the public university and the community college only 4 and 5 percent black respectively.

3/ Hartnett, op. cit., p. 57.

Table 4

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDING TRUSTEES, BY INSTITUTION TYPE SERVED, OF VARIOUS LENGTH OF TRUSTEE SERVICE*

Year of Appointment or Election	Institutional Type							
	Community College	State College	Public University	Private Junior College	Private Liberal Arts	Private University	Black	Total
Before 1950	2 %	3 %	5 %	6 %	9 %	7 %	10 %	7 %
1950 to 1954	1	1	5	5	4	6	10	4
1955 to 1959	5	6	4	6	9	9	10	8
1960 to 1964	18	14	12	15	12	12	13	14
1965 to 1969	43	38	45	39	36	36	36	38
1970 to Present	32	38	29	30	30	30	22	30

* Percentages down the columns may not add to exactly 100 percent because of rounding.

Data were obtained in late 1973 and early 1974.

Table 5

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDING TRUSTEES OF VARIOUS AGES, BY INSTITUTION TYPE*

Age	Community College	State College	Public University	Private Junior College	Private Liberal Arts	Private University	Black	Total
35 or Below	9 %	12 %	8 %	2 %	7 %	7 %	3 %	7 %
36 to 45	19	17	15	17	17	12	8	16
46 to 55	31	29	30	33	27	28	24	28
56 to 65	30	21	27	31	29	31	43	31
Over 65	11	11	18	16	19	21	20	18

* Percentages down the columns may not add to exactly 100 percent because of rounding

Table 6

SEX AND RACE OF THE RESPONDING TRUSTEES

	Institution Type							
	Community College	State College	Public University	Private Junior College	Private Liberal Arts	Private University	Black	Total
Percentage Male	87 %	80 %	85 %	76 %	81 %	89 %	80 %	83 %
Percentage Female	13	20	15	24	19	11	20	17
Percentage White	95	87	95	94	97	96	49	90
Percentage Black	5	11	4	5	2	2	51	9
Percentage Other	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	1

B. The Functioning of the Boards

Of central interest in the questionnaire survey was the style of functioning of the governing boards. At one level, this has to do with the effort devoted by the members, as attested by their record of attendance at board meetings and the time they devote to the trusteeship. But of greater impact were the trustee reports (together with reports of their presidents) as to how decisions are made, what factors adversely affect board functioning, the role and operation of committees, and changes that would improve board functioning (the latter of interest, of course, for it might suggest current difficulties in board functioning).

1. Frequency of Board Meetings

Previous studies[4/] have shown that the frequency with which governing boards meet is strongly affected by the kind of institution they serve. The current survey confirms this phenomenon, as the data presented in Table 7 will show.

As can be seen from Table 7, public college boards meet, most frequently, from 9 to 12 times a year, and private college boards meet, most frequently, from 3 to 4 times a year. Beyond this, all community college boards meet nine or more times a year, and more than half meet twelve or more times a year.

It should be pointed out that the numbers of presidents reporting are too small to lend much confidence in their representativeness. The major value of the data is the context they provide for understanding some of the other aspects of the responses reported elsewhere in this paper. Nevertheless, the frequencies do not vary significantly from the patterns reported by Hartnett from his 1967-68 survey,[5/] as shown by the excerpt from his report that appears as Table 8.

2. Attendance at Board Meetings, and Time Devoted to Trusteeship

The trustees were asked to report the number of days per month devoted, on the average, to their trusteeship; their presidents were asked

---

4/ Ibid.

5/ Ibid., p. 67.

Table 7

PERCENTAGES OF PRESIDENTS REPORTING VARIOUS FREQUENCIES OF BOARD MEETINGS PER YEAR, BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

Number of Times Per Year Board Meets	Proportions of Presidents at:						
	Community College	State College	Public University	Private Junior College	Private Liberal Arts	Private University	Black College
2 or less	0%	4%	7%	20%	25%	12%	79%*
3-4	0	27	17	53*	59*	58*	14
5-8	0	32	13	20	9	17	7
9-12	54*	36*	60*	7	7	12	0
13-20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
21 or more	27	0	3	0	0	0	0
Number of Presidents Reporting	37	22	30	15	44	24	14

* Entries marked with asterisk indicate modal categories, or the categories in which the largest number of respondents in each institutional group fall.

Table 8

PERCENTAGES FOUND BY HARTNETT (1967-68) OF TRUSTEES REPORTING SELECTED FREQUENCIES OF BOARD MEETINGS

Number of times per year Board meets	Institutional Category							
	Public Junior College	Public College	Public University	Private College	Private University	Catholic College/ University	Selective Public	Selective Private
2 or less	0	7%	3%	31%	12%	16%	7%	11%
3-4	5	25	20	49	49	48	43	49
5-8	8	29	21	11	24	23	7	26
9 or more	84	38	54	5	12	12	48	12

to report on their attendance at board meetings. For the total group of trustees, about two-thirds reported spending on the average only two days or less per month, although the proportions devoting only this much time from the community colleges (56 percent) or large public institutions (40 percent) are smaller, and the proportions for the private junior college (78 percent), private liberal arts college (73 percent), and black institutions (70 percent), are larger (see Table 9). An additional 20 percent of the total group spend three or four days per month; two percent report more than 10 days per month on the average. The differences among the trustees sorted by institutional type are real; almost 10 percent of the public university trustees report, for example, spending nine or more days per month, against a total group proportion of about 3.5 percent. Such time differences suggest substantial differences in the ways the boards of the different kinds of institutions function, particularly when viewed against the typical frequencies of board meetings.

Attendance at board meetings, as reported by the presidents, varies markedly by institutional type: the proportions of presidents reporting attendance as "excellent" (as opposed to "generally good" or "unsatisfactory") is shown in Table 10. Clearly the best record is that of the community college trustees, and the poorest that of the black institution trustees (who, other studies show, frequently represent many who live at some distance from the institution and who serve on more than one board). Only three institutional groups contained any presidents characterizing attendance as unsatisfactory: these groups were state colleges (4 percent of presidents responding), private universities (4 percent), and private liberal arts colleges (2 percent).

3. Factors Affecting Decisionmaking

Both presidents and trustees were asked to estimate the extent to which a number of factors operate in the decisionmaking process of their boards. A summary of these factors, and the proportions of respondents stating that each operates "to a considerable extent" in their decision-making process, are given in Table 11.

Table 9

PERCENTAGES OF TRUSTEES REPORTING VARIOUS NUMBERS OF DAYS PER MONTH DEVOTED TO TRUSTEESHIP

Number of Days Per Month	Institution Type							
	Community College	State College	Public University	Private Junior College	Private Liberal Arts	Private University	Private Black College	Total
1 or 2	56%	64%	40%	78%	73%	64%	70%	66%
3 or 4	29	29	37	13	16	22	14	21
5 or 6	10	1	12	5	3	6	10	6
7 or 8	2	4	2	2	5	4	2	4
9 or 10	0	2	3	1	2	2	0	1
More than 10	3	1	6	1	1	2	3	2

Table 10

PERCENTAGES OF PRESIDENTS, BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE, REPORTING TRUSTEE ATTENDANCE AT BOARD MEETINGS AS "EXCELLENT"

	Institution Type							
	Community College	State College	Public University	Private Junior College	Private Liberal Arts	Private University	Black	Total
Proportion reporting "Attendance Excellent"	75 %	36 %	67 %	53 %	41 %	38 %	29 %	51 %

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 11

PERCENTAGES OF TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENTS REPORTING "CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE" OF SELECTED FACTORS IN DECISIONMAKING

Factor	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Private Black		All Respondents	
	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President
Recommendations of the president	80	94	81	96	85	86	68	93	79	84	79%	84%	78%	93%	78%	91%
Strong guidance by committees	32	26	30	41	68	66	59	47	61	75	61	75	53	57	56	57
First hand knowledge of situation	53	-	34	-	53	-	54	-	47	-	49	-	54	-	49	-
Background information provided to board	-	97	-	77	-	72	-	40	-	72	-	74	-	100	-	77
Firm guidance by chairman	40	27	32	50	42	62	44	53	42	40	37	47	49	50	42	49
Active and vigorous debate	44	27	38	41	42	27	40	60	40	26	33	25	54	71	41	34
Private exchange among key board members	19	14	29	24	28	23	25	53	22	23	26	12	23	25	24	23
Recourse to extra-board expert opinion	28	22	20	14	22	10	14	13	16	9	19	17	26	7	19	14
Simple pressure of the situation	14	11	9	14	7	17	19	20	31	30	15	8	14	0	17	16
Pressures from extra-board groups	5	0	5	14	4	3	1	0	4	0	3	0	6	0	4	2

In general, presidents and trustees agree upon the relative importance of each factor, though in two interesting instances the presidents rate a factor much more strongly than do the trustees. These have to do with the influence on decisionmaking of the president's direct advice, or of "first hand knowledge" (this option for response was provided only on trustee questionnaire) versus "background information provided to the board" (president questionnaire option). In the second instance the response options are parallel but not congruent; yet, in each instance, presidents seem to overestimate their role if one takes trustee response as the criterion. Both kinds of responses are, to be sure, subject to bias.

This matter notwithstanding, the responses reveal the belief that the president is a key figure in the decisionmaking process. Informational resources, committee guidance, and guidance by the board chairman operate "to a significant extent" in the view of about half of the respondents. Trustees see active debate as a key mechanism somewhat more frequently than do presidents; other factors provided respondents were seen operating significantly in decisionmaking by relatively few respondents. Lobbying or pressure from extra-board groups is seldom rated a major factor, although (data not shown) 28 percent of the total group of presidents, and 30 percent of the total group of trustees, reported this to influence decisions "to a moderate extent."

When the decisionmaking reports by respondents from the different types of institutions are examined, significant differences do appear among these groups in the importance ascribed to some factors. Among the community college presidents, presidential recommendations and first hand knowledge are seen to play a role to about the same extent as for the total group; but, for each of all the other factors, only about one-fourth (or less) of these presidents see these as particularly influential. The community college trustees, in marked contrast, tend to agree with the extent of emphases reported for each factor by the total group of trustees, with the exception of the influence of committee guidance, where the pattern of smaller boards tends to reduce or eliminate the importance of committee structure. The tenuous, but potentially important, implication of this finding is that the decisionmaking process of community college boards is viewed by the community college trustee as typical of the college or university board in general, but is viewed by the president

as if such factors as guidance by chairman or active debate are, relative to boards of other kinds of institutions, less influential.

Public colleges and large universities generally follow the patterns in decisionmaking forces reflected by the groups of trustees or presidents as a whole, with several significant exceptions. Among the public college trustee respondents, only 30 percent (against 56 percent for all trustee respondents) rate committee guidance as a strong factor, and 58 percent rate pressures from extra-board groups (against 67 percent for all trustees) as operating to little or no extent. For the large public university respondents, presidents ascribe somewhat less frequently (than all presidents)--27 percent so vote--strong influence from active debate, and only 50 percent see little or no influence by extra-board groups (against 70 percent of all presidents). The large public university trustees see committee guidance more frequently (68 percent) as a strong influence than do all trustees (56 percent), and, like their presidents and the trustees of state college boards, reflect greater sensitivity to extra-board pressures than do the groups as a whole.

The private junior college boards stand out sharply from the group as a whole in the influence on decisionmaking their presidents ascribe to active debate: 60 percent of the junior college presidents, against 34 percent of all presidents, saw this factor operating to a considerable extent (the junior college trustees, however, give it the same import that most other groups of trustees give it). More remarkable disagreement between junior college presidents and trustees exists as to the influence on decisionmaking of private exchanges among members (53 percent of the presidents, but only 25 percent of the trustees, see this as operating to a considerable extent), and of presidential recommendations (93 percent of the presidents, but only 68 percent of the trustees see this as of considerable impact). And, unlike any other institutional group, the private junior college trustees ascribe more impact on decisionmaking to a first hand knowledge of the situation than do their presidents to the background information provided. A summary generalization seems to be that junior college presidents tend to place more emphasis on the parliamentary activities--in debate by or in private exchanges among their board

members--as well as the potency of their own recommendations--but may underestimate the role of the background material they provide.

The perceptions of forces in decisionmaking by respondents from private liberal arts colleges and private universities show some interesting parallels as well as some divergencies. In each of the two settings, the presidents see active debate less frequently a strong force than do all presidents (about 25 percent give central impact to this, against 34 percent for all presidents); and, they more frequently see important impact on decisionmaking from committee guidance (about 75 percent give this a strong influence rating, against 57 percent of all presidents); and, they more frequently (60 percent against 40 percent) see firm guidance by the chairman as important. On the other hand, 30 percent of private college presidents rate the impact of the "simple pressure of the situation" as strong, against only 8 percent of the private university presidents, or against an all-president proportion of 16 percent. This could reflect in some way a more frequent fiscal crisis or a more frequent powerful super-consistuency as represented by a church body--both more frequent, in all probability, for the private colleges surveyed than for the private universities. Only 12 percent of the presidents of private universities see strong influence from board member private exchanges (against 23 percent of all presidents); their trustees, however, report influences from private exchanges as frequently as do all trustees.

The trustees of private colleges and universities, like their presidents, ascribe greater impact on decisions (than do all trustees) of committee guidance, but, unlike their presidents, ascribe the same impact (as do all trustees) to firm guidance by the board chairman. Active debate is less frequently seen by private university trustees--33 percent--(than by all trustees--41 percent) as a strong influence. The most significant generalization of the foregoing is that the board committee is probably a more frequent fixture of the private college or university, or the large public university, than of the other kinds of institutions.

As with other comparisons, the black institution board stands out as distinct from the other groups. Twice as many presidents representing this type of institution--71 percent--see vigorous debate as a strong factor in decisionmaking as do the total group of presidents (where only 34 percent rate debate as strongly influential). They less frequently (than presidents of all institutions) see decisions as a function of pressure from the situation or as affected by recourse to extra-board experts. Across all decisionmaking forces offered, trustees of black institutions tend to agree relatively well with their presidents (except, of course, on those forces the presidents generally tend to overestimate--their own role, and that of information provided).

To summarize now with regard to differences among the kinds of institutions with regard to reported forces affecting decisionmaking: the president of the institution seems to play a major role in the decision-making process of the board, through his recommendations and through the background material he provides; this role is uniform in its apparent impact across institutions of various kinds, except for presidents of private junior colleges, where the influence, though still the strongest of the forces rated, is somewhat diminished (at least in the eyes of the trustees). The use of committees in achieving decisions is a procedure employed more frequently by the private institutions and large public universities; state colleges and community colleges seem to place less reliance on committees. The process of vigorous and active debate is more instrumental particularly for the private black institution boards and less so particularly for the private university board. Recourse to extra-board forces, private exchanges among two or more key board members, the simple pressure of the situation, and lobbying by or pressure from special interest groups, are perceived to play significant roles in decisionmaking less frequently, with a notable exception that of "pressure of the situation" for private liberal arts college boards.

4. Factors Perceived as Adversely Affecting Board Functioning

The survey questionnaires directed both to presidents and trustees postulated eighteen different factors that could adversely affect the

functioning of the board. Each factor was to be rated as handicapping the board functioning either "to a considerable extent," "to a moderate extent," or "to little or no extent." The first category, reflecting substantial interference by the factor, was seldom used by more than 10 percent of the president or trustee respondents; instead, they tended to assign one or the other of the latter two categories.

Table 12 shows the eighteen factors, and the proportions of presidents and trustees for the total group that felt each of the factors hampering their board's functioning either to a moderate or a considerable extent.

It should be first noted that, in general, the presidents and the trustees are in fairly good agreement. Presidents seem to see somewhat more frequently than trustees as deterrents the following: lack of understanding as to how a board should function; failure to use information resources available; obstructionist members; and tendency of the board to exceed its role. Trustees seem to see problems somewhat more frequently (than do presidents) from absenteeism and challenges from special constituencies. The discrepancies, however, for the total groups are, for the most part, slight.

Of the options given, the factors most frequently perceived as affecting board functioning adversely to a moderate or considerable extent, cited by at least 40 percent of presidents and trustees, are member inexperience, understanding how a board should function, and devoting time to trivia. Least often adversely affecting board functioning and cited by less than 25 percent of both presidents and trustees as a moderate or considerable disadvantage, are: board exceeding role, outside intervention, open meeting law, board-president conflict, and irreconcilable differences of opinion among members. If one considers that some of the adverse effects blame the president, some the structural characteristics or the board as a whole, some outside forces, and some one or more of the board members, it becomes fairly clear that among these classes of factors the respondents most frequently see their functional problems as caused by indifference or naivete or inexperience of one or more board members. If this is so, there may be a critical insight embedded therein: that is, the most direct remedy would be attention to those members who handicap their boards.

Table 12

PERCENTAGES OF TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENTS STATING SELECTED FACTORS AFFECTED THEIR BOARDS ADVERSELY TO A MODERATE OR A CONSIDERABLE EXTENT

Factors	Institutional Group															
	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Black		Total	
	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President
Inexperience of Some Members	42%	61%	45%	54%	34%	52%	57%	53%	46%	34%	43%	35%	48%	29%	46%	46%
Lack of Understanding by Some Members How Board Should Function	43	61	49	67	45	55	49	53	40	52	46	42	46	50	44	55
Too Much Time Devoted to Trivia	48	56	48	41	46	36	47	40	38	52	37	42	41	31	42	45
Challenges From Special Constituencies	38	25	19	41	51	48	24	13	37	32	41	8	41	0	39	28
Inadequacy of or Failure to Use Information Resources	30	47	42	59	29	32	42	40	35	20	36	39	44	50	36	46
"Dead Wood" on Board	18	17	30	4	26	17	40	47	38	48	38	42	49	64	35	32
President's Failure to Use Information Resources	39	33	43	32	42	13	35	40	33	32	30	25	33	36	35	31
Absenteeism	28	19	50	27	17	17	34	20	35	32	30	22	52	57	34	26
Difficulty in Achieving Acceptable Resolution of Problem	31	44	29	38	33	38	30	13	32	34	27	42	27	14	30	35
Structure of Board	24	14	36	24	22	23	32	60	28	50	23	29	42	64	29	35
Leadership Style of Board Chairman	30	42	35	32	29	37	31	60	23	27	26	17	34	43	28	35
Board Failure to Accept Responsibility	24	33	29	14	19	14	36	40	29	34	30	33	30	36	28	29
Obstructionist Members	25	39	17	36	21	38	16	33	16	18	19	17	18	21	18	29
Irreconcilable Differences of Opinion Within Board	21	31	13	23	15	21	13	27	15	16	15	4	12	14	15	20
Board-President Conflict	18	19	16	0	16	13	17	13	12	11	10	4	16	8	14	11
Open Meeting Law	23	33	26	27	30	32	10	0	9	2	6	4	15	8	14	17
Intervention From Outside Sources	18	25	19	41	26	31	8	7	9	11	9	0	13	7	13	18
Board Exceeding Role	10	36	16	32	12	41	8	20	7	9	8	12	8	14	9	24

When the respondents are considered in terms of the types of institutions they represent, some interesting (and statistically significant) differences emerge, although, as a whole, the differences among institutions are less marked than they were for factors affecting decisionmaking (suggesting that problems that affect board functioning are more general to boards as a whole than are particular decisionmaking procedures, which tend to vary more as a function of type of institution).

Community college presidents are less frequently troubled than other presidents by needs to revise board structure, or by deadwood on their boards. More frequentiy than other presidents, however, they feel board functioning is handicapped by obstructionist members, irreconcilable differences, the board exceeding its role, and an open meeting requirement. The community college trustees perceive difficulty less frequently (than other trustees) from deadwood on their board, but more frequently they see difficulties from obstructionist members and an open meeting requirement.

State college and public university presidents are, like community college presidents and to a less extent than all presidents combined, relatively infrequently concerned with deadwood on their boards. They more frequently (than the group of presidents as a whole) see problems from their board exceeding its role, challenges from special constituencies, intervention from outside sources, and the open meeting law or practice. Public university presidents see less frequently than any other group problems arising from inexperience of some members.

With regard to state college and public university trustees, the two institutional groups are in clear distinction from other institutional groups of trustees only with regard to the greater extent of problems they perceive from open meeting laws or practices. On the adverse effect of absenteeism and of board structure, state college trustees see more handicap, and public university trustees less handicap, than do trustees in general. State college and public university trustees also, like their presidents, see more problems from outside intervention than do the respondents as a whole.

A reasonable summary of the most distinctive features of the three public institution groups is that they are all handicapped more frequently than the other groups by the open meeting practice and obstructionist members, and are marked by a presidential belief that the board exceeds its role.

Private liberal arts college and private university presidents perceive less difficulty (than other presidents) from obstructionist members, the board exceeding its role, intervention from outside, and, of course, an open meeting law or practice. Along with the two other private groups (black institutions and private junior colleges), they profess handicap more frequently than public institution presidents from deadwood on their boards. The trustees of the private liberal arts colleges and universities tend to follow the total trustee group response patterns rather closely.

The private junior college presidents are distinct from the presidents as a whole in perceiving relatively less difficulty from any outside pressures or an open meeting practice. Their problems, relative to the total group of presidents, reside in board structure, the leadership style of the chairman, irreconcilable differences among board members, and deadwood on their board. Their trustees stand out from trustees in general principally from the lesser problems they see from extra-board pressures.

The black institution presidents, more frequently than any other group of presidents, see moderate or severe difficulty from the structure of their boards and from deadwood on their boards. About two-thirds of the black college presidents--against one-third of the presidents in general--so rate these factors. They are relatively less frequently bothered by what they perceive as their boards exceeding a proper role, or any outside challenges or interferences. Their trustees also more frequently ascribe difficulty to board structure than do other trustees, and half--against a proportion of one-third of all trustees--see moderate or severe difficulties from absenteeism and deadwood.

5. Support of President by Board Members

The president's questionnaire asked the president to rate the helpfulness of members of his board in seven different areas. Table 13 shows the proportion from each institutional group who perceived members of their board as "very helpful" in each of the seven areas. With the single exception of helpfulness in finding "new sources of support for valued institutional goals," differences among the seven institutional groups were not significant; in this instance, as would be expected, board members were perceived as very helpful by 11 percent, 4 percent and 7 percent respectively of the community college, state college, and public university presidents, but by 20 percent, 36 percent, 32 percent, and 25 percent respectively of the private junior college, private black, private liberal arts, and private university presidents.

6. Reports of Long Range Planning

About 80 percent of the responding presidents, and 85 percent of the responding trustees, reported a long range plan projecting institutional goals. The only potentially significant variation from this pattern by one or another institutional group was within the private university group, where 67 percent of the presidents (against 86 percent of the trustees) reported a plan. Although these discrepancies may reflect differences in what presidents, as opposed to trustees, consider to be a plan or to constitute goals, they also call forcefully to mind two limitations in all the president/trustee comparisons: these are (1) the responding presidents do not necessarily represent the same institutions as the responding trustees; and (2) for each institution with a responding president, the president is represented by only one vote, while those institutions with larger numbers of responding trustees carry greater weight in the totals than those with smaller numbers of responding trustees. There are (as documented by the data in Table 2) differences among the institutional groups in the proportions of responding presidents that do not match the differences in the proportion of responding trustees.

Trustees and presidents were asked if their boards were involved in the formulation of this plan by "formulating and deciding on plan," by "advising

Table 13

PERCENTAGES OF PRESIDENTS REPORTING BOARD MEMBERS AS "VERY HELPFUL" IN SELECTED AREAS

Area	Institutional Group							
	Community College	State College	Public University	Private Junior College	Private Liberal Arts	Private University	Black	Proportion Stating Members "Very Helpful"
Providing personal support and substaining friendship	69%	73%	70%	67%	82%	70%	71%	74%
Providing firm policy decisions when needed	75	68	72	60	73	67	86	72
Providing intelligent professional advice	39	59	47	60	59	62	57	54
Defending president against critics	49	50	43	43	46	30	36	43
Defending institution against critics	49	54	40	33	39	33	36	41
Interpreting position of groups within or outside institution	31	24	23	20	43	21	43	30
Finding or alluring new sources of support	11	4	7	20	32	25	36	19

on and reviewing plan," or by "approving and confirming plan." The proportions of presidents and trustees in each institutional group responding to each alternative are given in Table 14.

Of particular interest in the data presented in Table 14 is the fact that the modes of advising and reviewing or approving and confirming are more frequent board involvement styles than the more active process of formulating and deciding. Also of interest is the discrepancy between the reports of presidents and trustees: trustees in general feel almost three times more frequently than the presidents that the trustee involvement is one of formulating and deciding; this tendency seems particularly marked in the private university instance, where almost one-fifth of the trustees, but none of the presidents, saw the boards in the more active role. Of interest also is that this more active mode of involvement was found frequently in the instance of the private junior college where about one of every four presidents or trustees report this style of functioning in planning activities.

Trustees and presidents were asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction with the reasonableness and attainability of their long range plan. When provided four response alternatives ranging from "quite satisfied" to "quite concerned," 26 percent of the presidents, and 31 percent of the trustees, indicated they were quite satisfied (Table 15). Only five percent of the presidents and trustees indicated they were quite concerned. The only potentially significant variations in this perspective by the separate institutional groups occur for the private liberal arts trustees, where 38 percent are quite satisfied, and with the state college and public university trustees, where only 24 percent and 22 percent respectively are quite satisfied.

C. The Effectiveness of the Boards

A central question addressed by the survey was the effectiveness of the boards in achieving a proper role. Twelve dimensions believed to be relevant to or symptomatic of effective functioning were postulated, together with a summary item requiring an estimate of the general or overall effectiveness of the board. The major use to be made of this set of items was, of course, their employment as a criterion of effectiveness against which to examine the relationship of other variables such as particular practices or elements of board composition. (These interrelationships will be summarized in Section IV of this report.)

Table 14

PERCENTAGES OF PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEES REPORTING DIFFERENT MODES OF INVOLVEMENT IN FORMULATION OF LONG RANGE PLAN

Mode of Involvement	Institutional Group															
	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Black		Total	
	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee
Formulating; Deciding	3 %	14 %	6 %	10 %	0 %	7 %	27 %	24 %	9 %	26 %	0 %	17 %	15 %	23 %	7 %	19 %
Advising; Reviewing	38	46	50	50	40	47	27	46	54	39	62	48	54	52	47	45
Approving; Confirming	59	41	44	39	60	45	46	30	37	35	38	35	31	25	46	35

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 15

PERCENTAGES OF PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEES WHO ARE "QUITE SATISFIED" OR "QUITE CONCERNED" ABOUT THE REASONABLENESS OF THEIR LONG RANGE PLAN

Evaluation of plan	Institutional Group															
	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Black		Total	
	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee
"Quite Satisfied"	23%	29%	21%	24%	27%	22%	27%	29%	29%	38%	31%	31%	23%	33%	26%	31%
"Quite Concerned"	7	5	5	4	0	2	18	6	6	5	0	4	8	6	5	5

Nevertheless, it may be of interest at this point to examine the general perceptions of the presidents and trustees as to the relative effectiveness of their boards on the different dimensions.

The twelve specific dimensions, as defined on the questionnaire for the respondents, were:

1) Diversity: The board as a whole contains the necessary diversity of talents, skills, experience, and interests among its members to complement one another and to strengthen the whole board.

2) Structure: The board is structured in such a way that individuals and/or committees assume a proper, active, and effective role in the operation and activities of the board.

3) Member Involvement: Members demonstrate a high degree of interest in the institution and in their role and responsibilities as trustees or regents; they are genuinely involved in the institution's problems and prospects.

4) Knowledgeability: The members of the board are well-informed about the institution, its place in the higher education system, and in the currents of society affecting higher education.

5) Rapport: The members of the board have mutual respect for each other, regardless of differences of opinion, and maintain an effective working relationship with each other.

6) Sense of Priorities: Board members, and the board as a body, tend to be concerned with important and long-range issues rather than with trivial matters.

7) Direction: The chairman is respected, strong, and skilled both in making certain that different points of view are expressed, and in obtaining satisfactory decisions.

8) Sensitivity: The board is representative of, or sensitive to, different constituencies and viewpoints.

9) Strength: The board is strong enough to achieve effective educational policy decisions in the face of extraneous political or other outside pressures.

10) Financial Support: The board contains a reasonable number of members who provide or help get financial support.

11) Board/President Relationship: There is an effective working relationship between the board and the president or chancellor and his staff.

12) Accomplishment: The board has a genuine sense of progress and achievement, and members derive satisfaction from their service.

Four response options for rating each of the dimensions were provided: for the twelve specific dimensions, these were "excellent," "good," "fair," and "poor." For the general dimension (described in Table 16 an "overall effectiveness"), these were, in effect, "in the highest category," "not in the highest category, but satisfactory," "less than satisfactory but adequate," and "in need of major improvement." Table 16 shows the dimensions and provides the proportions of presidents and trustees, in toto and by institutional categories, who rated their boards in the highest of the four categories.

Almost half of the presidents and trustees rate their boards in the highest category of general ("overall") effectiveness; this agreement in level of assessed effectiveness seems generally to prevail when presidents and trustees of particular institutional categories are examined.

With regard to overall reaction to the twelve specific dimensions, more than half of the respondents see their boards as excellent on board-president relationships and rapport among members. Almost half see a skilled and respected chairman as an excellent contribution to board effectiveness. At the other extreme, only one-fifth of the respondents rated their boards as excellent in terms of member knowledgeability of the institution, defined as awareness of "its place in higher education, and of the currents of society affecting higher education." On the dimensions of financial support, board structure, sensitivity to views of different constituencies, and a sense of priority, only one-third (or less) of both trustees and presidents rated their boards as excellent.

In general--whether considering the respondents as a whole or by the kind of institution they represent--agreement between presidents and trustees generally seems relatively high. The most notable exception is on the ratings of the positive impact of board member diversity, where only 27 percent of the presidents, but 42 percent of the trustees, rated the boards excellent. This trend was consistent across the institutional types, with the most extreme discrepancy for public universities, where 20 percent of the presidents,

Table 16

PERCENTAGES OF TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENTS RATING SELECTED DIMENSIONS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS IN THE HIGHEST CATEGORY

Dimension	Institutional Group															
	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Black		Total	
	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President
Overall Effectiveness	51%	54%	40%	35%	50%	52%	50%	40%	51%	44%	54%	48%	43%	36%	48%	46%
Board-President Relationship	62	76	55	62	60	57	56	80	70	79	65	67	61	43	63	68
Rapport Among Members	55	57	60	43	60	47	54	53	64	72	56	67	58	36	59	56
Direction by Chairman	38	40	38	29	53	34	51	50	52	62	46	74	49	57	48	49
Sense of Accomplishment	50	62	38	38	50	40	34	27	44	56	42	42	39	29	43	46
Board Member Diversity	45	27	45	33	48	20	36	27	41	23	45	38	32	29	42	27
Board Strength	37	35	38	29	41	37	38	33	43	49	47	52	31	43	41	40
Member Involvement	38	43	30	19	49	47	28	20	40	30	34	33	28	21	36	33
Sense of Priorities	27	27	25	24	31	13	29	33	39	42	33	38	34	21	33	29
Sensitivity to Different Views	27	32	32	38	40	30	24	33	31	35	28	33	32	36	30	34
Board Structure	30	30	16	19	40	33	22	33	33	30	37	33	25	38	30	31
Financial Support	13	23	9	5	15	7	14	0	34	33	44	29	15	14	25	19
Knowledgeability of Institution and Higher Education	22	22	18	10	22	13	14	20	24	20	18	29	23	21	20	20

but 48 percent of the trustees, rated their diversity as excellent. Other discrepancies of possible significance include: on effective chairmanship and sense of priorities (as well as on diversity), public university trustees rate their boards more highly than do their presidents; and three-fourths of the private university presidents and about two-thirds of the private college presidents see their board chairmanship as excellent, while approximately half of their trustees agree.

Some highly interesting differences seem to appear as a function of the kind of institution represented by the respondent. These, drawn from the data presented in Table 16, are summarized in Table 17. The selection of most frequent or least frequent examples from the table was predicated on the following relatively arbitrary rules: where differences among a class of respondents by institutional type are statistically significant, the highest and the lowest institutional group of respondents are named; and, where the differences among institutional types are not statistically significant, deviations from the all group average of at least five or more percentage points for trustees, or at least 10 or more percentage points for presidents, are required to achieve, for the table, an entry as "most" or "least" frequent.

Even a cursory inspection of the entries in Table 17 shows that the respondents from state colleges, private junior colleges (usually the trustees only), and private black institutions tend to rate their boards in the highest effectiveness category <u>least</u> frequently, and that the respondents from the private liberal arts, private university, and public university (usually the trustees only) rate their boards in the highest effectiveness category <u>most</u> frequently. The community college presidents stand out as rating their boards highest in general effectiveness and sense of accomplishment; on the latter dimension, they are joined by their trustees. It is not entirely safe to generalize from this that the rankings describe truly differential board effectiveness, or levels of institutional hazard to board effectiveness, for the dimensions used may be differentially relevant to the several kinds of institutions (the financial support category is a good example). Also, dimensions unnamed may be important for some boards (e.g., rapport of board with state budget authorities) but not for others. Nevertheless, the differences suggest more challenges to effective functioning for the private

Table 17

IDENTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL SUBGROUPS OF RESPONDENTS WHO (1) MOST FREQUENTLY OR (2) LEAST FREQUENTLY EVALUATED SELECTED BOARD QUALITIES AS "EXCELLENT"

	Group Rating as Excellent	
	Most Frequently	Least Frequently
1. General effectiveness	Private University Trustees Community College Presidents	Private Junior College Trustees State College Trustees Black College Presidents
2. Diversity	Public University Trustees Private University Presidents	Black College Trustees
3. Board structure	Public University Trustees	State College Trustees State College Presidents
4. Member involvement	Public University Trustees Public University Presidents	Private Junior College Trustees Black College Trustees State College Presidents
5. Knowledgeability		Private Junior College Trustees State College Presidents
6. Member rapport	Private Liberal Arts Trustees Private Liberal Arts Presidents	Private Junior College Trustees Black College Presidents
7. Sense of priorities	Private Liberal Arts Trustees Private Liberal Arts Presidents	State College Trustees Private University Presidents
8. Direction by chairman	Public University Trustees Private University Presidents	Community College Trustees State College Trustees State College Presidents
9. Sensitivity to Constituencies	Public University Trustees	Private Junior College Trustees
10. Strength	Private University Trustees Private University Presidents	Black College Trustees State College Presidents
11. Financial support	Private Liberal Arts Trustees Private Liberal Arts Presidents	State College Trustees Private Junior College Presidents

- continued on next page -

Table 17 Continued

Quality	Group Rating as Excellent	
	Most Frequently	*Least Frequently*
12. Board-President Relationship	Private Liberal Arts Trustees Private Junior College Presidents	State College Trustees Black College Presidents
13. Sense of Accomplishment	Community College Trustees Public University Trustees Community College Presidents	Private Junior College Trustees Private Junior College Presidents

junior college, state college, and private black college boards than for boards of other private institutions, public universities, and (perhaps) the community colleges.

D. Changes in Boards Perceived as Leading to Improvement of Board Functioning

Both presidents and trustees were asked to react to a list of changes that might improve board functioning; each item presented was to be checked if the respondent saw that change as a positive one for his board. The proportions of presidents and trustees in the total group who indicated each factor as a positive change are shown in Table 18.

In general, as in other comparisons, presidents and trustees are fairly consistent in the extent to which they see the improvement potential of the various factors, although the presidents put more emphasis on various aspects of trustee performance--e.g., replacement of one or more board members, committee structure, guidance by chairman. The greater attention to matters of long range significance, seen as an improvement by more than half of each kind of respondents, suggests that the presidents and trustees see their boards too much caught up in more routine matters or considerations critical to the moment. Improvement from better orientation of board members to the institution, also frequently seen as a potential benefit by both presidents and trustees, similarly relates to matters easily within the control of the president and the board. Relatively small numbers of the total groups see improvement resulting from increase or decrease in size of board.

Rather sharp differences among institutional groups emerge when the respondents are grouped according to the kind of college they represent. As would be expected from other data already cited, only 16 percent of the community college presidents see improvement in better committee structure (against 34 percent of all presidents); otherwise, this class of institution does not stand out markedly from the others.

For the state colleges, only 36 percent of the presidents (against 60 percent for all presidents surveyed) see replacement of one or more members leading to improvement; on the other hand, one in five of their trustees (against about one in eight of all trustees) see improvement from better exercise of the chairmanship role.

Table 18

PERCENTAGES OF TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENTS INDICATING SELECTED CHANGES THAT WOULD IMPROVE BOARD FUNCTIONING

Change	Institutional Group															
	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Black		Total	
	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President
More Attention to Matters of Long Range Significance	58%	62%	48%	59%	61%	60%	53%	53%	46%	53%	51%	46%	55%	71%	52%	59%
Better Orientation of Members of Institution	41	38	44	45	40	30	42	33	37	35	42	29	41	50	40	37
Replacement of One or More Members	35	62	38	36	32	43	39	73	36	67	39	54	51	79	38	60
Greater Contact With Members of Other Boards	39	--	38	--	37	--	39	--	38	--	31	--	42	--	38	--
More Information on Trends in Contemporary Society	35	43	32	36	31	37	31	20	28	31	29	25	37	43	31	34
Improved Board Committee Structure	22	16	38	36	24	20	34	54	27	37	19	38	40	64	28	34
More Systematic Reporting by College Officials	33	24	31	27	37	23	29	7	20	22	28	17	32	29	28	23
Better Understanding by Chairman of His Role	17	16	19	23	10	17	11	27	9	22	12	17	14	7	12	19
Decrease in Size	1	--	4	--	5	7	18	13	19	18	22	12	8	7	14	9
Increase in Size	3	1	7	14	8	3	9	13	4	11	5	4	19	7	7	7

The public university trustees more frequently than all trustees combined see improvement vested in more attention to matters of long range significance, and more systematic reporting by administrative officers. They less frequently (than all trustees) see replacement of one or more members an improvement.

The private junior college presidents less frequently than all presidents see improvement from more systematic reporting by administrative officers, or from better understanding of trends in contemporary society, and more frequently than all presidents see need to strengthen the chairman's role. Their trustees, on the other hand, stand closely with all trustees in the relative emphasis placed on these three and the other areas for improvement.

The trustees of the private liberal arts colleges see improvement less frequently (than all trustees) from better attention to long range matters, and from more systematic reporting by college officials. Twice as many of their presidents (than of all presidents combined) see board improvement from decrease in size.

The presidents of the private universities differ from the total group of presidents in less frequently projecting improvement from better orientation of board members or more attention to matters of long range significance. Their trustees stand apart from the others in believing less frequently that changes in committee structure would improve board effectiveness.

The black college presidents stand out markedly in the greater frequency with which they mark most areas as grounds for improvement: in every respect except change in size of board or in the role of the chairman, they believe improvement could be effected by the change indicated to a greater degree than the other presidents perceive. In this, they also see promise from change more frequently than do their trustees, though their trustees more frequently (than all trustees) see positive impact only in changes in committee structure or replacement of one or more members.

E. Challenges Perceived by the Presidents in the Decade Ahead

The presidents were asked to indicate the importance of each of a number of challenges facing governing boards in the decade ahead. The proportions of presidents in each institutional group stating each challenge to be "of greatest importance" is shown in Table 19.

Table 19

PERCENTAGES OF PRESIDENTS ASSIGNING "OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE" TO SELECTED CHALLENGES FACING GOVERNING BOARDS

Challenge	Institution Type							
	Community College	State College	Public University	Private Junior College	Private Liberal Arts	Private University	Black	Total
Fiscal planning	81%	96%	87%	87%	91%	96%	100%	90%
Increased State and Federal Interaction	51	68	66	40	39	48	57	52
Achieving needed institutional changes	25	54	21	73	66	52	77	49
Changes in structure of higher education	49	59	63	53	34	48	50	49
New faculty demands	68	43	34	7	32	26	29	38
Students' needs for relevance	35	27	31	33	36	22	57	34
Education needs of "new" students	42	27	21	26	16	4	50	25
Legal challenges to board authority	38	48	43	0	9	4	14	24
New question: proper role of board	16	25	23	13	16	13	43	20
Productive involvement: community affairs	31	14	10	27	11	13	50	20
Intra-Institution challenges to board authority	36	38	20	7	9	4	0	18
Changes in lay board composition	3	5	10	20	14	4	29	10

Clearly, fiscal planning and policy represent a pervasive challenge to all institutions in the eyes of the presidents: from eight out of ten community college presidents to all black college presidents, this challenge leads the list in perceived importance. Overall, nine out of ten of the responding presidents rated fiscal challenge of great importance.

Half of the total group of presidents rated increased state and federal interaction in institutional affairs as a challenge of greatest importance. Among the institutional groups, this challenge was more frequently a concern of the presidents of the state colleges, public universities, and black institutions, and less frequently a concern of the private junior and liberal arts colleges.

Achieving needed institutional changes represents challenges more frequently perceived by the presidents of private black, junior, and liberal arts institutions, and least frequently by the presidents of community colleges and public universities. The extremes, as may be noted in Table 19, range from about two out of ten public university presidents to about eight out of ten black college presidents. "Changes in the structure of higher education" tends to represent a relatively uniform challenge across the groups, with public university presidents most concerned, and private liberal arts college presidents least concerned.

New demands from faculty was rated a challenge of greatest importance by less than one out of ten private junior college presidents, but by almost seven out of ten community college presidents. Between these two extremes, the other public institution presidents seem more concerned about new faculty demands than the other private institution presidents.

Student demands for a relevant educational experience is rated as of greatest importance as a challenge for boards by almost six of every ten black institution presidents, but only about two of every ten private university presidents. For the other institutional groups, presidents represent the all-group average of three of every ten so voting. A similar extreme exists for meeting the educational needs of new kinds of students, with half of the black institution presidents, but only one of twenty-five of the private university presidents, ascribing great importance to this challenge.

The remaining challenges were ranked "of great importance" by 20 percent or less of the total group of presidents. The largest discrepencies from this trend are: the black college presidents, half of whom see great importance

in challenges for becoming productively involved in community affairs, and 43 percent who see challenge in new questions as to the proper role of the board; the community college presidents, where about one-third see legal challenges to board authority, challenges from within the institution to board authority, and community involvement as future issues; and the state college presidents, where half are concerned with legal challenges, and where about four out of ten are concerned with institutional challenges to board authority. Changes in lay board composition, the lowest rated challenge overall, is of concern to about three of every ten black presidents, and two of every ten private junior college presidents.

F. Informational and Service Needs of Presidents and Board Members

The presidents' questionnaire asked the respondents to rate the value or attractiveness of a variety of kinds of information or activities a service organization might provide to trustees; the trustees themselves were also asked to react. The proportions of presidents and trustees rating various kinds of information as "extremely valuable" are given in Table 20; the proportions rating various service activities as "very attractive" are given in Table 21.

The general agreement between presidents and trustees, aggregated over institutions, in perceived value of the various kinds of information is obvious. These figures, however, obscure some sharp differences (a) among different kinds of institutions, and (b) between presidents and trustees within some specific institutional groups.

With regard to institutional differences: no statistically significant disagreement emerges on such matters as curricular innovations, budgeting practices, problems similar institutions face, and institutional information on non-financial matters (proportion of faculty with tenure, etc.). There are, however, within these categories occasional instances where presidents or trustees of one or two of the institutional categories stand out as sharply discrepant from the general trend: e.g., presidents of the private universities and large public universities see information on curricular innovation as extremely valuable only half as frequently as do all

presidents; or, about one in five state college presidents, as opposed to more than eight out of ten private black college presidents, see budgeting information as extremely valuable. However, more statistically significant (i.e., more reliable) differences among the institutional types appear, for the trustees, on the other categories: interest in information on good governance procedures, fund raising and trends in federal and state support, national higher education trends, legal challenges, and additional instititional financial information.

On good governance procedures, the trustees of the public colleges and the private black colleges express interest more frequently than do trustees of the other two private institutional categories. The public and private university presidents express least frequently interest in high level manpower needs, with black college presidents at the other extreme; trustees at the private institutions (excluding the black) are less frequently interested in this area than the public and black institution trustees. Personnel management practices are of greatest interest to the public institution trustees; public institution trustees are more interested in national higher education trends than their private institution counterparts. About twice as many public institution trustees (or presidents) as private institution trustees (or presidents) are interested in information on legal challenges. The sharpest differences, however, are in the areas of support and finance: generally, information on fund raising is much more frequently rated as valuable by private institution presidents and trustees than by public institution presidents and trustees; and, state support trends are perceived of greater value

Table 20
PERCENTAGES OF TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENTS RATING VARIOUS KINDS OF INFORMATION AS "EXTREMELY VALUABLE"

Kind of Information	Institutional Group															
	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Black		Total	
	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President
Problems Similar Institutions Are Facing	63%	57%	68%	38%	58%	69%	58%	57%	64%	56%	54%	62%	61%	69%	61%	58%
Fund Raising	21	22	31	41	31	21	58	64	48	63	39	62	67	100	44	48
National Trends in Higher Education	44	32	51	29	44	24	34	36	42	23	35	38	48	54	42	31
Trends in State Support of Higher Education	56	36	53	24	48	45	33	21	30	30	26	29	48	38	38	33
Budgeting, Financial Planning, and Maintenance Practices	36	33	35	18	31	24	42	50	35	46	35	33	49	83	37	38
Curricular Innovations in Other Institutions	40	38	44	19	35	14	39	43	37	30	32	13	36	33	37	27
Personnel Management Practices for Faculty and Administration	44	44	45	24	39	21	34	21	27	23	32	42	38	58	35	32
Additional Information From Institutional Sources on Financial Aspects	22	22	24	19	27	7	36	57	39	51	31	42	46	62	34	35
Trends in Federal Support of Higher Education	40	19	40	5	29	28	32	21	30	23	28	38	52	62	34	26
Good Governance Procedures in General	36	57	41	33	40	27	26	36	27	39	29	25	37	62	32	39
Additional Information From Institutional Sources on Such Matters as Proportion of Faculty With Tenure, Etc.	28	19	38	43	34	35	23	36	34	37	32	46	35	31	32	33
Legal Challenges to Board, and Ways of Coping With Them	37	53	45	46	41	39	16	21	22	23	20	17	29	23	27	33
High Level Manpower Needs	31	17	34	23	24	3	16	21	14	17	16	12	25	31	20	16

Table 21

PERCENTAGES OF TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENTS FINDING VARIOUS SERVICE ACTIVITIES VERY ATTRACTIVE

Activity	Institutional Group															
	Community College		State College		Public University		Private Junior College		Private Liberal Arts		Private University		Black		Total	
	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President	Trustee	President
Brief Reports	61%	61%	57%	76%	51%	60%	50%	64%	43%	70%	40%	58%	49%	85%	48%	66%
Workshops for New Trustees	53	49	50	35	51	40	37	21	40	34	28	12	57	43	43	35
Forums for Exchange of Ideas and Experience	43	51	50	43	38	37	30	46	32	49	25	13	41	31	35	41
Suggested Readings	32	35	34	19	32	17	23	43	26	27	30	12	36	38	29	26
Procedures for Identifying New Trustees	--	22	--	35	--	8	--	38	--	36	--	13	--	62	--	28
Provision of Specialized Consultants	29	39	33	20	24	14	27	29	25	20	18	25	35	36	26	25
National Program of Research	22	20	25	5	27	20	16	7	18	14	16	8	26	38	20	16

more frequently by public institution respondents than private institution respondents. The extremes, for example, on fund raising information: 100 percent of the black institution presidents and 67 percent of their turstees, rate this as extremely valuable; for the community college presidents and trustees, the comparable proportions are 22 percent and 21 percent. On information on federal support trends, only one in 20 state college presidents rates such as extremely valuable, while six out of ten black college presidents so vote.

Within the institutional groups, discrepancies in rated value of the various kinds of information between the presidents and the trustees representing that group occur most frequently in the state college category. From about two times as many to eight times as many state college trustees as presidents rate as valuable information on curricular innovations, trends in state and federal support, personnel management practices, national higher education trends, and problems similar institutions face. Almost twice as many black college presidents as black college trustees see value for the trustee in information on good governance procedures and fund raising. And, almost four times as many public university trustees as public university presidents see as valuable additional information from institutional sources on university finance.

Reactions to proposed service activities by the trustees and presidents show again the relative agreement of the two classes of respondents. Again, also, there are differences among and within the institutional groups. Private university presidents and trustees are least interested in workshops when compared to the other institutional groups; public institution trustees are more interested in brief reports, forums, research programs, and specialized consultants, than are private institution trustees.

Only one in twenty state college and public university presidents state high interest in a research program or commissioned papers, against from one-fourth to one-third of their trustees. About twice as many public and

private university trustees as private university presidents are interested in suggested readings for trustees.

Thus, the data suggest frequently that although some information or service activities are more attractive than others, and although presidents in general tend to rank their interest at congruent levels with rankings of trustees in general, there may well be some institutional situations where the presidents' opinions are not at all consistent with those of their trustees (this occurs most frequently for the state college situation, when presidents do not see as much value in information or service activities as the trustees see). There are, as would be expected from the different kinds of problems the different kinds of institutions face, variations among institutional categories that affirm that the presidents and trustees are interested in their particular problems, as opposed to an academic or scholarly interest in the trusteeship in general.

G. Summary of Differences Between Presidents and Trustees in Perceptions of Their Boards

Many of the critical differences found and emphasized in the foregoing sections are those among respondents representing different types of institutions. At this point, it may be well to summarize the findings with particular regard to the general differences and similarities between the presidents and the trustees.

With regard to perceptions as to how decisions are made by the boards, presidents tend to ascribe more influence to their own recommendations, to the information they provide, and to guidance by the chairman than do the trustees, though both groups see the president's recommendations as the most salient influence. (Neither presidents nor trustees who feel they have effective boards were found to report any higher influence of presidential recommendations on board decisions than did presidents and trustees who feel they have weak boards.) Presidents appear to ascribe less import on decisions (than do trustees) to vigorous debate at board meetings, or to recourse to expert opinions from extra-board sources, and feel more frequently than trustees that guidance by committees operates in decisionmaking to little or no extent.

In general, when given the opportunity to react to a variety of factors that could adversely affect board functioning, only twelve percent at most of either class of respondents indicated a particular factor to handicap the functioning of their board "to a considerable extent." Presidents and trustees

saw problems with the following factors with about equal frequency: committee structure, leadership style of board chairman, president/board conflict, problem resolution difficulty, board failure to accept responsibility, dead wood or inexperienced members on board, inadequate information, or devoting too much time to trivia. But: proportionally, three times as many trustees as presidents saw considerable detriment from failure by president to achieve effective communication or from challenges from special constituencies. Twice as many presidents (proportionally) as trustees saw considerable detriment from obstructionist board members, irreconcilable differences among board members, tendency of board to exceed its proper role, intervention from outside sources, and the fact of open meeting law. Presidents also more frequently than trustees felt their boards to be handicapped from lack of member understanding as to how a board should function.

Presidents and trustees showed remarkable agreement on the frequency with which they felt various changes would improve board functioning, with one exception: six out of ten presidents felt one or more board members should be replaced, while fewer than four out of ten trustees were so moved.

Of the twelve postulated dimensions of effectiveness of board functioning, presidents and trustees were again in relatively good agreement, with perhaps only two exceptions: trustees appeared to view their boards more positively than presidents on diversity and on capability to provide or help get financial support.

On the attractiveness of various kinds of information or services, trustees more frequently rate as valuable (than do their presidents rate as valuable for trustees) information on curricular innovations, trends in federal support, national higher education trends, and workshops for new trustees. Presidents appear to be more likely than trustees to express high interest in information on good governance procedures in general or legal challenges, and to availability of brief informational reports or to occasional forums for exchange of ideas and experiences (although such interest, as elsewhere noted in this report, is not related to the degree of effectiveness the president perceives in board functioning).

Although in general the agreement between presidents and trustees is perhaps the most remarkable finding, the possible differences noted suggest that presidents may tend to overestimate slightly their positive impact on their boards or the negative impact of one or more board members, and underestimate slightly the various intra-board aspects of functioning, even while believing more frequently that their boards lack understanding of how they should function. Presidents in general appear more interested than trustees in having trustees exposed to information or activities on the dynamics of board functioning (although this interest is as high for presidents who feel their boards are strong as it is for those who feel their boards are weak, as other data to be presented in the next section will show). Trustees appear more frequently than presidents to want information on the national institution of higher education--a class of information, interestingly enough, that the examination of relationships between various factors and effectiveness reported in the next section shows was more frequently sought out for their trustees by those presidents who felt they had effective boards.

A generalization of the findings concerning president versus trustee perceptions that may most appropriately summarize their main thrust is as follows: the president, who must use the board to maintain the institution, is sensitive to the support he feels the board gives him to the extent that board effectiveness appears virtually synomymous with personal support by the board. The board, on the other hand, is more sensitive to its intrinsic operational and functional characteristics. Both presidents and trustees, however, agree that good leadership by the board chairman, effective use of committees, a tradition of vigorous debate, and adequacy of information on which to base decisions, are central components of effectiveness. These qualities supersede other problems of outside pressures, obstructionist or lethargic members, or matters of size of board or frequency of meetings.

IV. FINDINGS: FACTORS RELATED TO PERCEPTIONS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS

A. The Structure or Definition of Board Effectiveness

One section (Section III) of the survey questionnaires (see Appendix B) listed twelve dimensions of effectiveness of board functioning. (A definition of these twelve dimensions has been provided on pages 38 and 39 of this report.) A thirteenth item called for an overall rating of effectiveness of functioning.

These items were designed to provide a detailed and intensive examination of the respondents' perceptions of their boards on a variety of qualities that each might be logically related to effectiveness of functioning. In addition, the relationships between each of the specific qualities and the item requesting a general overall rating of effectiveness should indicate the relative degree to which each specific quality is associated with the more general or overall effectiveness rating.

Relationships among the twelve qualities and the general effectiveness ratings were determined by computing Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients[6/] for the total group of presidents' responses and the total group of trustee responses; the interrelationships are shown in Table 22. In general: although each of the twelve qualities was more highly related to the overall effectiveness rating than to the other eleven qualities, interrelationships among the twelve qualities were uniformly positive and high. For readers who are not familiar with the statistical procedure: what this means is that the general effectiveness rating, where respondents considered overall effectiveness as opposed to one or another of the twelve different specific aspects, is the best summation of one or all of the twelve specific aspects. Also, and more importantly, no single specific aspect of the twelve is revealed as a markedly more critical dimension of board effectiveness than any of the other eleven.

An attempt to identify separate underlying dimensions that would make statistical sense or provide efficient summary[7/] proved in vain: that is,

---

6/ For a brief definition of this statistic, see the footnote to Table 22.

7/ Factor analysis employing the Varimax rotational procedure. This statistical procedure asks the questions: (1) considering the relationships among a number of separate measures, can a smaller number of dimensions adequately express the variations found; (2) what structure, or new dimensionality, is reflected by the content of particular measures now combined as "factors?"

Table 22

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG VARIOUS "DIMENSIONS" OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS
FROM RATINGS BY TRUSTEES (N=1315) AND PRESIDENTS (N=165)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	Diversity	*	44	36	37	30	32	29	42	40	28	24	42	48
2.	Committee Structure	35	*	49	45	36	43	44	40	45	31	36	55	57
3.	Member Involvement	31	39	*	52	42	41	36	35	44	32	26	51	50
4.	Knowledgeability--Institution and Higher Education	44	41	55	*	41	46	35	39	45	31	30	49	48
5.	Rapport among Members	37	23	44	50	*	43	39	33	42	24	37	47	42
6.	Sense of Priorities	32	41	34	50	57	*	42	38	47	31	36	53	47
7.	Direction by Chairman	29	37	27	42	40	51	*	39	39	29	40	45	48
8.	Sensitivity to Different Constituencies	40	27	36	39	36	41	37	*	45	20	26	41	41
9.	Strength (from extraneous pressures)	42	23	38	42	51	48	44	53	*	42	34	53	54
10.	Financial Support	34	19	34	36	44	36	37	21	46	*	26	42	44
11.	Board/President Relationships	32	28	39	43	53	49	51	42	53	43	*	49	46
12.	Accomplishment	43	41	54	58	50	47	38	37	47	52	52	*	63
13.	Overall Effectiveness	56	34	54	56	53	46	46	40	51	50	58	55	*

Note: Decimal points omitted. Values for trustees shown above diagonal; values below diagonals are for presidents. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients shown are a standard statistical measure of degree of relationship between two measures. This coefficient can range from +1.00 (perfect positive relationship), through 0.00 (no relationship) to -1.00 (perfect negative relationship). It is not properly interpretable as a percent agreement.

each of the thirteen items seem to be measuring about the same thing, or a single quality that can be described as perception of general effectiveness of board functioning. The most likely explanation is that if the respondents felt positively in general about their board, they rated it high on all counts, and vice versa. Although this result does not permit insight into the relative importance of the different qualities for a concept of effectiveness, it permits, by summing the ratings on the twelve qualities, a more reliable index of how the respondent perceived his board than would any of the twelve single scales.

B. Relationships between Board Structural Characteristics and Effectiveness of Boards

Relationships among a number of structural characteristics, as reported by trustees and presidents, and the general effectiveness rating were determined, and are presented in Table 23. No statistically significant[8/] relationships were found between the presidents' perceptions of effectiveness and the frequency of board meetings, the fact of board committees having nonboard members, the conviction that committees should meet with nonboard members, the fact of limitations on trustee terms, the presence or absence of a long-range plan, and the kind of involvement (formulating, advising, approving) of the board on the long-range plan. On the other hand presidents who felt attendance was satisfactory, who were not satisfied with their long-range plan, who did not believe that limitations should exist on terms of trustee service, and who reported that committees met frequently with nonboard members, also tended to rate their boards high on effectiveness. Also: the longer the president had occupied that role—or the older he was--the more likely he was to consider his board to be effective—a situation that could result because presidents of long standing become more comfortable with their boards for a variety of reasons, or because boards that have retained their president are more effective, or both.

8/ A "statistically significant" relationship is one where the correlation coefficient expressing the degree of relationship is, with a prescribed degree of certainty, larger (in a positive or negative direction) than zero (a condition of no relationship). Spurious relationship estimates can occur as a function of chance and pecularities of the data; in general, the larger the number of paired measures involved in the computations, the smaller the value of the correlation coefficient required to attain statistical significance or the greater the probability of detecting a slight but real association.

Table 23

RELATIONSHIP OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS TO SELECTED STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS AS REPORTED BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEES

	Source of Report	
	Trustees	Presidents
Number of times board meets	--	NS
Quality of attendance at board meetings	--	.35*
Committees have non-board members	--	NS
Committees meet with non-board members	--	.14
Committees should meet with non-board members	--	NS
Presence of limitations on trustee terms	--	NS
Belief limitations should exist on trustee terms	--	-.15
Presence of long-range plan	.19*	NS
Board formulation of long-range plan versus advising or approval role	NS	NS
Degree of satisfaction with long-range plan	-.18	-.25*
Years of service as institution president	--	.19*
Age of president	--	.12
Days per month devoted to trusteeship	NS	--

Note: Only those relationships significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are reported. For meaning of this statement, see footnote 8 on page 57.

* Coefficient significant at the .01 level.

Trustees, unlike the presidents, were more likely to rate their board high on effectiveness if their institution had a long-range plan; and, like the presidents, were more likely to consider themselves effective if they were not satisfied with, but were "quite concerned" about their long-range plan. Trustees devoting few days per month to the trusteeship rated their boards the same as did those devoting many days per month.

C. Relationships between Decisionmaking Styles and Effectiveness of Boards

The procedures used by boards to reach decisions may vary; and, decisionmaking would seem to be a central activity of governing boards. Both trustees and presidents were asked similar questions as to the extent a variety of factors operated in this process, and the relationships between the degree to which each factor influenced decisions and perceptions of effectiveness were determined. The results are presented in Table 24.

From the trustees' and presidents' viewpoints: those who felt their boards were operating under "the simple pressure of the situation and the unavailability of alternate solutions," or were susceptible to pressures from outside groups, or saw decisions resulting from "private exchanges among two or more key members," tended to rate their boards low in effectiveness. Where trustees felt they operated with "first hand knowledge of the situation," they tended markedly to rate their effectiveness highly. High board effectiveness was also associated by the trustees with strong guidance by committees, active and vigorous debate at meetings, firm guidance by the chairman, and, to a lesser extent, recourse to expert opinion outside the board, and recommendations by the president. The presidents were most likely to rate their boards as effective if they perceived strong guidance in decisionmaking from committees, and a tradition of vigorous debate; also associated with effectiveness, though less strongly, was the presidents' belief that background information prepared by the administration was noted and used, and that expert opinion from outside the board was employed.

D. Relationships between the Kinds of Problems Boards Experience and Ratings of Board Effectiveness

The particular kinds of problems afflicting boards, or the kinds of improvement felt desirable, should reveal conditions that deter effective functioning of boards. Both trustees and presidents were asked to note adverse factors they experienced, and to suggest whether a variety of changes in structure or procedures would improve their boards' effectiveness. The relationships between adverse influences and effectiveness ratings are presented in Table 25.

Table 24

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BOARD EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS AND DECISIONMAKING PROCESS

Decisionmaking Process	Source of Ratings	
	Trustees	Presidents
Firm guidance by chairman	.19*	NS
Recourse to expert opinion outside board	.12*	.12
Active debate at board meetings	.23*	.24*
Strong guidance by committees	.32*	.26*
Individual, private exchanges	-.09*	-.19*
Recommendations by presidents	.07	NS
Pressure of situation	-.25*	-.17
Lobbying or pressures from outside groups	-.13*	-.17
First-hand knowledge	.38*	--
Use of background information from administration	--	.13

Note: Only those relationships significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are reported.

* Coefficient significant at the .01 level.

Table 25

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BOARD EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS AND ADVERSE FACTORS AFFECTING BOARD FUNCTIONING

Adverse Factors	Source of Ratings	
	Trustees	Presidents
Committee structure	-.19	-.38*
Leadership style, board chairman	-.33*	-.39*
Failure of president to communicate	-.24*	-.34*
Board/president conflict	-.19	-.23*
Difficulty in resolving problem	-.20	-.21*
Obstructionist members	-.15	-.14*
Irreconcilable differences of opinion among board	-.19	-.26*
Failure to exercise board responsibility	-.40*	-.46*
Exceeding proper role	-.15	-.15*
Absenteeism	-.15	-.14*
Dead wood on board	-.29*	-.37*
Challenges from special constituencies	NS	-.11*
Intervention from outside	NS	-.11*
Inexperienced members	-.32*	-.32*
Lack of understanding as to how board should function	-.40*	-.40*
Inadequacy of information	--	-.34*
Too much time to trivia	-.34*	-.37*
Open meeting law or practice	NS	-.12*
Failure of members to use information provided	-.24*	--

Note: Only those relationships significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are reported.

* Coefficient significant at the .01 level.

With regard to adverse factors: noting almost any detriment was, as might be expected, related to perception of board as ineffective. The strongest associations with ineffectiveness, for both trustees and presidents, were convictions that the board failed to exercise its proper responsibility or lacked understanding of how a board should function, or devoted too much time to trivia. These qualities may, however, be more safely classified as symptoms, associated conditions, or reflections of ineffectiveness than as causes of ineffectiveness.

On the other hand, in order of strength or degree of association, trustees who tended to consider their boards ineffective saw problems with their chairman's leadership style, their committee structure and functioning, "dead wood" on the board, presidential failure to communicate, inadequacy of information, inexperienced board members. and irreconcilable differences of opinion among members. To a lesser but still significant extent, board/president conflict, difficulty in problem resolution, obstructionist members, outside challenges or intervention, and an open meeting law were also associated by the trustees with ineffectiveness.

The presidents tended to react similarly, though the associations were not as clearly established (particularly with regard to committee structure). They also associated ineffectiveness with failure of board members to use information provided.

The associations between effectiveness ratings and the specifying of certain changes in the board as desirable are given in Table 26. In general, as the negative and generally significant correlation coefficients show, those respondents who feel any changes are desirable rate their boards as less effective than those who do not specify any desirable changes. The stronger associations are found for changes such as better understanding by the chairman of his role or better orientation of board members to institution, than for changes in size or greater contact with members of other boards.

E. Relationships between Information or Service Needs of Boards and Board Effectiveness Ratings

One section of the presidents' and trustees' questionnaires dealt with respondent interest in a variety of kinds of information, or of service

Table 26

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BOARD EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS AND CHANGES IN BOARD FELT DESIRABLE

Improvement Needed	Trustees	Presidents
Increase in size	NS	-.06
Decrease in size	NS	-.11*
Replacement of one or more members	-.16	-.27*
Attention to matters of long-range significance	-.12	-.25*
Better orientation of board members to institution	-.28*	-.24*
Better understanding of role by chairman	-.27*	-.31*
Improved committee structure	-.17*	-.23*
More systematic reporting: administrative officer	NS	-.19*
Greater contact with members of other boards	--	-.11*
More information: trends in contemporary society	NS	-.11*

Note: When coefficient is negative, proper interpretation is that noting the particular improvement needed is associated with low effectiveness rating. Only those relationships significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are reported.

* Coefficient significant at the .01 level.

activities a professional organization might provide. Degree of respondent interest in these items was examined in relationship to the respondent's rating of the effectiveness of his board. The results are presented in Table 27.

The most apparent immediate finding is that trustees who perceive their boards to be weak express a higher interest in some aids than do those who perceive their boards to be effective, while presidents with boards they believe to be effective express a higher degree of interest in other aids. For example: for the trustee, interest seems to follow a recognition of need for assistance; for the president, interest seems to signal a kind of vitality--e.g., presidents more satisfied with their boards tend to seek information for themselves and their boards on federal support trends, national trends in higher education, high level manpower needs, and curricular innovations in other institutions. Presidents do not, apparently, see outside aid of the sort suggested by the questionnaire items as a procedure for strengthening their boards. The trustees who are troubled with the effectiveness of their boards tend to seek information on how to operate as a board or on how to be more effective in what may be considered basic responsibilities--budgeting and planning, fund raising, and the like.

F. Relationships between Challenges the Future is Perceived to Hold and Board Effectiveness

On the survey of presidents, additional questions were asked as to the importance ascribed to future challenges of various kinds. Relationships between these reactions and perception of board effectiveness are given in Table 28.

Of twelve different kinds of potential future challenges, only three--intra-institution challenges to board authority, new questions as to the proper role of the board, and achieving institutional changes necessary for survival--were associated with perception of board effectiveness. In these three instances, presidents giving low importance to these challenges rated their board to be of higher effectiveness, suggesting that presidents troubled by these challenges reflect less confidence in their boards. Not significantly related to effectiveness were challenge of new fiscal planning problems, structural change in higher education including increased federal or state intervention, new demands from faculty and students, changes in

Table 27

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN RATINGS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS AND (1) INFORMATIONAL NEEDS AND (2) DESIRABLE SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Informational Needs	Source of Ratings	
	Trustees	Presidents
Good governance procedures in general	NS	-.14*
Curricular innovations in other institutions	.15	NS
Budgeting, financial planning, and maintenance practices	NS	-.14*
Fund raising	NS	-.05
Trends in federal support of higher education	.21*	NS
High level manpower needs	.16	NS
Personnel management practices for faculty and administration	NS	-.12
National trends in higher education	.17	NS
Legal challenges to board, and ways of coping with them	NS	NS
Problems similar institutions are facing, and what they are doing about them	NS	-.05
Additional information from institutional sources on financial aspects	NS	-.08
Additional information from institutional sources on internal data	NS	NS
Activity Needs		
Workshops--new trustees	NS	-.09*
Brief reports	NS	-.11
Occasional forums	NS	-.06
Research programs	NS	-.09*
Commissioned papers	NS	NS
Suggested readings	NS	NS
Provision of consultants	NS	-.12
Procedures to identify prospective new trustees	NS	--

Note: A negative coefficient indicates that high value ascribed to information or service is associated with low effectiveness ratings. Only those relationships significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are reported.

* Coefficient significant at the .01 level.

Table 28

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PRESIDENT'S PERCEPTION OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS, AND IMPORTANCE ASCRIBED TO PARTICULAR CHALLENGES FACING GOVERNING BOARDS

Challenge	
Fiscal planning and policy	NS
Structural change in higher education	NS
Legal challenges to board authority	NS
Challenges within institution to board authority	-.16
New questions: proper role of board	-.26*
Meeting needs of new kinds of students	NS
Increased state or federal intervention	NS
New demands from faculty	NS
New demands from students	NS
Productive involvement with community	NS
Achieving institutional changes needed for survival	-.25*
Change in composition and structure of board	NS

Note: Only those relationships significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are reported.

* Coefficient significant at the .01 level.

board composition and structure and legal challenges, or community involvement. The board is perceived to be less effective when there is fear that drastic institutional changes are needed for survival, where the authority of the board is shaky within the institution, or where its role is not clear. The more pervasive challenges--those affecting higher education institutions generally rather than the particular institution--tend not to be associated with local board performance.

G. Relationship between Presidents' Perception of Personal Support from Board and his Rating of Board Effectiveness

The data presented in Table 29 suggest that the president who feels any kind of support from his board is highly likely to rate his board positively; the associations seem uniformly strong, whether dealing with support in the form of friendship and advice or of defending the institution against critics. And--the strongest positive association seems to exist between positive evaluation of board and perception of "finding or achieving new sources of support for valued institutional goals." Here, the term support was, in all probability, interpreted to mean financial as well as moral support.

H. Relationship between Trustee Selection Practices and Board Effectiveness

The presidents were also asked to report to what extent each of a variety of factors or forces seemed to influence the selection of new trustees, as well as the extent to which each of these factors should figure in selection. Relationships between perception of board effectiveness and these factors are shown in Table 30.

Those presidents who felt that trustee selection was influenced by knowledgeability of the candidate on higher education issues, on his general leadership skills, and on his stature in the community, were clearly more likely to perceive their board as effective. Also related to effectiveness were influence in selection by competence in a professional speciality, fund raising capability, past institutional affiliation, and advice of board members (but not of chairman, nor, oddly enough, the advice of the president). Where presidents felt their chairmen should have a stronger voice in trustee selection (this implies a chairman with a weak role, and/or a president anxious for the chairman to assume a stronger role)--or where they felt that past institutional affiliation should be given more emphasis--they also tended to see their boards as effective. Remarkable in these data is the fact that no forces experienced or felt desirable were negatively related to effectiveness

Table 29

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BOARD EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS BY PRESIDENT AND HIS PERCEPTION OF KIND AND EXTENT OF SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM HIS BOARD

Kind of Support	
Personal support; friendship	.40*
Professional advice	.43*
Providing needed firm policy decisions	.44*
Interpretating policy to intra or extra institutional sources	.38*
Defending institution against critics	.39*
Defending president against critics	.36*
Finding new sources of support	.48*

Note: Only those relationships significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are reported.

* Coefficient significant at the .01 level.

Table 30

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BOARD EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS BY PRESIDENT AND HIS PERCEPTION OF (1) FACTORS INFLUENCING SELECTION OF NEW TRUSTEES AND (2) DEGREE TO WHICH FACTORS SHOULD BE OPERATIVE

Factors Influencing Selection of New Trustees	Rating of Actual Impact	Rating of Desired Impact
Advice of Board Chairman	NS	.17
Advice of Board Members	.15	NS
Advice of President	NS	NS
Community stature	.18*	NS
General leadership skills	.24*	NS
Past institutional affiliation	.13	.13
Knowledgeability on higher education issues	.26*	NS
Representation of different constituencies	NS	NS
Competence in a professional speciality	.16	NS
Fund raising capability	.15	NS

Note: Only those relationships significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence are reported.

* Coefficient significant at the .01 level.

(though all options offered were potentially desirable procedures)--or, that the boards of institutions where presidents felt that advice of chairman, advice of president, or representation of different constituencies influenced selection of trustees were not judged either more or less effective.

I. Limitations of the Study of Factors Related to Board Effectiveness

Before attempting to summarize these findings, some further note of caution is in order. First: the criterion of board effectiveness is the respondent's judgment, not a quality determined empirically by outside or independent definition and data. The perceptions of effectiveness may, in some instances, clothe an unwarranted sense of tranquility about board functioning. Other data on the board or the vitality of the institution would be needed before equating perception with reality.

Second: The relationships are derived from data pooled over all types of institutions. Legal challenges to board authority, for example, may prove to be a more salient factor for public institution boards than for private institution boards. Such a study is left for later analysis. Also deferred at this time for later analysis are the questions that might be answered by pooling trustee data for each institution, toward determining extent of agreement among trustees of a given institution, and the relationship of that consensus (or lack of consensus) to the view held by the president.

Finally: from data too voluminous for efficient summary at this time, other factors not reported may exist which explain the ratings made by respondents. These include trustee characteristics (e.g., inexperienced trustees may take one point of view, and experienced trustees another); institutional characteristics beyond those distinguished by the seven categories employed in the analyses reported (e.g., respondents from institutions in financial duress may differ sharply in reactions from those from institutions with balanced budgets); and board characteristics (e.g., size, professional and educational level of members, etc., may color perceptions and judgments).

J. Summary of the Analysis of Board Effectiveness

The picture that emerges of the study of factors associated with the perception of an effectively functioning board seems to have several prime ingredients. In the effective board, there is comfort with and reliance upon a committee substructure. The firm guidance of the chairman (more clearly than the leadership of the president) also appears critical, as does the

quality of information made available to the board. The important obstructions include absenteeism, "dead wood," and inexperienced members, which are intrinsic qualities rather than situational circumstances of less clear impact such as outside intervention, open meeting laws, or reliance upon the president's recommendations in decisionmaking. The belief that decisions are based on the pressure of the situation and the absence of alternatives, or are influenced by pressure groups or by private agreement among key trustees, is not compatible with the conviction that the board is effective. The perceptions of the presidents about effectiveness seem to be generally congruent with those of trustees, with one major exception: the president who perceives his board as effective does tend to value information from outside sources more than presidents who view their board as ineffective. Trustees, on the other hand, who feel their boards are floundering tend to be more receptive to outside aid than trustees rating their board highly, particularly where the information on the service activity has to do with performance of basic responsibilities of policy setting and planning, with style of functioning, or with solution to the problems of their institution. They are not likely, however, to express much concern for the general national picture; information on those concerns (e.g., trends in federal support, manpower needs) are seen as desirable by the presidents who feel their boards are effective. Although these relationships between effectiveness and informational needs are slight, their significance for the roles of president or of board are obvious.

Appendix A

Elaboration of Procedures Employed in the Survey, and Comments on Bias

Appendix A

Elaboration of Procedures Employed in the Survey, and Comments on Bias

A. Purpose

The purpose of the survey was to gather systematically a variety of data on aspects of board structure and functioning, and to determine from the perceptions of presidents and trustees how effective they believe their boards to be on a variety of dimensions.

B. Survey Content

Initial drafts of the survey questionnaires employed were developed by the staff of the Center for Educational Research and Evaluation of the Research Triangle Institute (RTI), following establishment of specifications of content by the AGB study director and professional staff of AGB. Critical content objectives for both president and trustee questionnaires included: rating of effectiveness of board functioning along a number of different dimensions; factors perceived as adversely affecting board effectiveness; decisionmaking strategies and procedures; presence or absence of long-range plan, and satisfaction with it; structural characteristics or procedural activities that might improve board effectiveness; informational and service needs; and, personal or experimental characteristics such as age, sex, race, years of service, frequency of board meetings, attendance at board meetings, etc. In addition, the president's questionnaire included the presidents' ratings of the kind and extent of support provided him by the trustees, the nature and importance of challenges facing the board, and the influence of a variety of factors in the selection and appointment of new trustees.

C. Pretest of Survey Questionnaires

Preliminary forms of the survey questionnaires were pretested by mail, using the members of the AGB Board and the Commission on the Future of AGB (trustees' questionnaire), and the AGB Council of Presidents (presidents' questionnaire). These individuals provided virtually a 100 percent response, with most providing a wealth of detailed suggestions and criticism.

The two questionnaires were generally revised on the basis of the pretest information, and reduced in length by approximately 50 percent, to permit completion in from 20 to 30 minutes.

D. Selection of Sample of Institutions

Seven institutional categories were identified by AGB professional staff and consultants as deserving separate attention in an examination of how the boards of colleges and universities function. Those institutions with a multi-campus governing or coordinating function were excluded, because the pretest activities left no doubt that the questionnaires developed for the single-institution boards contained many items simply not relevant for the multi-campus boards, and more importantly, failed to recognize the variety of roles, functions, limitations, relationships to other authorities, and unique challenges these boards experience. The seven categories were: (1) public community colleges, (2) public four-year colleges; (3) large public universities; (4) private junior colleges; (5) private traditionally black institutions; (6) private liberal arts colleges; and (7) private universities.

Using the 1972 inventory of higher education institutions established by the National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Office of Education--as supplemented by updating information maintained by Educational Testing Service for the College Entrance Examination Board--some 3,000 institutions of higher education were assigned, by computer search, to one or another of the seven categories. Then, within each category, a random selection of institutions was drawn, to achieve a pre-determined number from 30 to 55 in each (with larger numbers drawn from categories with larger numbers of institutions to draw from). These lists were shared with AGB staff.

E. Adjustments in the Sample of Institutions

The lists were culled by AGB staff to exclude, generally, non-accredited institutions; institutions offering purely technical or specialized training (e.g., bible and divinity schools, technical institutes, medical colleges, etc.); military academies; and, as noted, public institutions with multi-campus boards. The resulting lists still contained so many colleges of low visibility to AGB staff that the validity of random selection for study purposes was brought into strong question. On the one hand, value in

ability to generalize to the national population of institutions of a particular kind was recognized; on the other hand, AGB staff felt strongly that groupings of institutions with a preponderance of unknown or low visibility members would detract from general interest in any results based thereon. A compromise plan was reached to divide the samples (of all categories except state colleges and large public universities, where the original random samples were retained after culling out those institutions without their own separate governing board) into two halves--one from the random selection, and the other from nominations by the AGB study director and Dr. J. L. Zwingle, then president of AGB.

F. Enlistment of the Institutions for the Survey

The presidents of the institutions falling into the final study sample were then written by AGB to explain the survey, to obtain updated rosters of trustees (where the institution was not a member of AGB and trustee addresses were consequently not in hand), and to invite participation in the study. These letters of invitation were mailed, in October 1973, to 322 institutions as follows: public community colleges, 60; private junior colleges, 35; private traditionally black institutions, 33; private liberal arts colleges, 68; state colleges, 48; private universities, 35; and large public universities, 43. Following a second letter to non-responding institutions (this time asking to advise only if they did not want to be included), final lists of institutions for survey were established. The number of institutions declining to participate was inconsequential: three community colleges, one private junior college, one black liberal arts college, two private liberal arts colleges, two state colleges, and two private universities. Refusals from the random sample were replaced by other institutions chosen at random; other institutions were added from the random or select lists, to yield the numbers shown in Table 1 (page 5 of this report). The institutions surveyed are listed in Appendix C.

G. The Samples of Responding Individuals

The number of trustees varies, of course, from institution to institution. Where the number of active trustees was equal to or less than 20, all trustees were mailed survey questionnaires; where there were more than 20 trustees, the chairman (if one was designated) was selected, along with 19 other trustees

selected by random means. Thus, a total of 282 institutions and presidents, and 4,050 trustees, were provided the questionnaires by direct mail, with posting of questionnaires between 12-20 November 1973. By 12 December, 142 or half of the presidents, and 1,156 or 33 percent of the trustees had responded. The 3,036 nonrespondents[1/] were written on 14 December with a request to complete the questionnaire at their earliest convenience, or to telephone the survey director at RTI (collect) if there were questions or if another form were needed. By a cut-off date of 15 February 1974, 188 presidents and 1,581 trustees (including 31 board chairmen) had returned questionnaires, of which 186 and 1,495 respectively were considered complete enough to be usable.

H. Potential Bias in the Samples

It would be proper, as a part of this brief elaboration of procedures, to discuss two potential sources of bias in the data generated. First, as in any survey with less than complete returns, one must consider the probable reasons that some respondents failed to cooperate. Considering the rather sensitive nature of the questionnaires, one might expect that those trustees and presidents less satisfied with one another or with the functioning of their board (in spite of assurances of confidentiality) would be less likely to respond. It is also reasonable to assume that those trustees with strenuous demands on their time (e.g., busy corporation executives) would be less likely to answer. (Later analyses of the returns can yield information as to whether AGB member institutions, or those whose presidents had actively accepted the invitation to participate, were more likely to respond). At this point, it is safe to state that the most likely significant bias would be the exclusion of institutions with deeply troubled boards. As a consequence, generalizations from the data as to the extent of malfunctioning of boards may be distorted and relationships between effectiveness and associated structural or procedural

---

1/ Much of the data requested in the questionnaire could be considered highly sensitive, as content dealt with persistent problems and failures. Accordingly, a coding procedure was established to place under separate custody the identities of the respondents, so that returned questionnaires available to the data analysis staff at RTI and to AGB could be identified only as from "college X" in a particular institutional category. (Survey clerks maintained code numbers of returned questionnaires, which were referred to the separate custodian for obtaining a listing of nonrespondents on 14 December.)

factors may be somewhat ambiguous because of the probable lack of heterogeneity of levels of effectiveness.

I. Analysis to Estimate Impact of Bias Caused by Adjustments to the Random Sample of Institutions

A second potential source of bias lies in the substitution of specially selected institutions for a portion of the random samples. Fortunately, the impact of this bias can be tested by comparing the distribution of responses to the survey items for the random members versus that of the select group.

This analysis was conducted, with the general finding that those trustees from random sample institutions did not differ, in personal characteristics or in response content, from responders in selected institutions with but eleven exceptions (at the .01 level of statistical significance)[2/] among some 500 tests for possible difference. (Analysis of potential differences among presidents from random versus selected institutions are not statistically worth testing because of the small numbers involved in each institutional category.) The eleven exceptions are described in Table A-1.

At the .05 level of significance, thirty-five differences between the random and the specially selected sample were found. Fifteen of these were in the private liberal arts group, suggesting the specially selected sample is less affected by absenteeism or by challenges from special nonboard groups, and that this group rates the effectiveness of its board more highly on rapport among board members, financial support, and strength against intervention from outside sources. Among the other institutional groups, differences at the .05 level numbered seven for the public community colleges, five each for the private universities and the black private liberal arts institutions, and three for the private junior colleges. Although there is a trace of suggestion that the specially selected private liberal arts colleges are more secure in their perception of the quality of the institution and the board, the differences seem relatively inconsequential for the basic purposes of the survey.

2/ A difference "statistically significant at the .01 level" is one where the difference is sufficiently large that there is only one chance in a hundred that the assumption the difference is real (rather than results from chance) is incorrect. Any level can be specified; at the ".05 level," there would be five chances in a hundred of the incorrect assumption.

Table A-1

DIFFERENCES FOUND* IN RESPONSES OF TRUSTEES FROM
RANDOM SAMPLE VERSUS SPECIALLY SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Institutional Category	Specially Selected Group
Private Black	Report less dependence in decisionmaking on recourse to expert opinion outside the board
Private Liberal Arts	Report less dependence in decisionmaking on recourse to expert opinion outside the board Report less dependence in decisionmaking on strong guidance by committees Report less frequently adverse effects from board structure Report more frequent crises related to institutional policy, enrollment, minority students, and fewer related to administrative problems Contain trustees with longer periods of service as trustee
Private Universities	Report less frequently adverse effects from board structure
Private Junior Colleges	Report more dependence in decisionmaking on the president's advice
Public Community Colleges	Report less dependence in decisionmaking on strong guidance by committees Are more interested in information on fund raising Are more interested in information on legal challenges

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Appendix B

The Survey Questionnaires Used with Trustees and Presidents

NOTE: The percentages of trustees (or presidents) in the total group of respondents who answered each item alternative are superimposed on the sample questionnaire.

Sample Trustee Questionnaire

1. Before 1950 7
50-54 4
55-59 7
60-64 13
65-69 38
70-Present 30

STUDY OF EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNING BOARDS

Association of Governing Boards
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C.

2. Age
Below 30 3
30-35 5
36-40 6
41-45 10
46-50 13
51-53 16
56-60 15
61-65 16
66-70 11
70+ 6

I. You and Your Institution

1. In what year were you first elected or appointed as a trustee at your present institution? _____ year

2. Your age? _____ Your sex? M 83 F 17 Your racial or ethnic group? 90 W; 9 B; 1 other

3. Over the past year, about how many days per month did you devote, on the average, to duties or tasks directly associated with your trusteeship? _____ Days 1--38 2--27 3--14 4--7 5-6--6 7-8--4 9-10--1 11+--2

4. What have you found to be the greatest challenge to you personally in your tenure as board member?

_____

II. The Functioning of Your Board

1. What quality of the board chairman do you feel is most valuable to you or your institution in his role as chairman? (If you are the board chairman, what quality of the chairman do you feel your board and institution require most?)

_____

2. What quality of your institution's president is most valuable with regard to the functioning of the board?

_____

3. To what extent do each of the factors listed generally operate in the decisionmaking process of your board?

	To a considerable extent	To a moderate extent	To little or no extent
a. Firm guidance by chairman	☐ 42	☐ 48	☐ 10
b. Recourse to expert opinion outside the board	☐ 20	☐ 52	☐ 28
c. Active and vigorous debate at board meetings	☐ 41	☐ 43	☐ 16
d. Strong guidance by committees or committee chairmen	☐ 56	☐ 32	☐ 12
e. Individual, private exchanges among two or more key members	☐ 24	☐ 47	☐ 29
f. Recommendations by institution's chief administrative officer	☐ 78	☐ 19	☐ 2
g. The simple pressure of the situation and the unavailability of alternative solutions	☐ 17	☐ 42	☐ 41
h. "Lobbying" by or pressures from extra-board groups-alumni, students, political bodies, etc.	☐ 4	☐ 30	☐ 67
i. First-hand knowledge of the situation	☐ 49	☐ 42	☐ 8

4. Does your institution have a long-range plan projecting institutional goals? 88 ☐ Yes ☐ No 12

How was the board principally involved in the development of this plan?

☐ By *formulating* and *deciding* on plan 19
☐ By *advising* and *reviewing* plan 45
☐ By *approving* and *confirming* plan 35

How satisfied are you with the reasonableness and attainability of the long-range plan?

☐ Quite satisfied 31
☐ Reasonably satisfied 50
☐ Somewhat concerned 14
☐ Quite concerned 5

5. What items have *not* appeared on the board agenda in the last one or two meetings that you feel ought to be discussed?

_____

6. To what extent have the following *adversely* affected the functioning of the board in the past two years?

	To a considerable extent	To a moderate extent	To little or no extent
Board structure; i.e., functioning of committees	☐ 8	☐ 21	☐ 71
Leadership style of the board chairman	☐ 8	☐ 20	☐ 72
Failure by the president to achieve effective communication on some issue	☐ 12	☐ 23	☐ 65
Conflict between the board and the president	☐ 5	☐ 10	☐ 86
Difficulty in achieving resolution of a problem that is acceptable to all members	☐ 5	☐ 25	☐ 70
One or more obstructionist members	☐ 4	☐ 14	☐ 82
Strong and irreconcilable differences of opinion within the board	☐ 3	☐ 12	☐ 85
Failure of the board to accept and exercise its responsibility as a board	☐ 7	☐ 21	☐ 71
Tendency of the board to exceed its proper role	☐ 2	☐ 7	☐ 91
Absenteeism (from illness or other situation) of one or more members	☐ 5	☐ 29	☐ 66
Too much "dead wood" on the board	☐ 7	☐ 28	☐ 65
Challenges from special constituencies (i.e., students, faculty, alumni, minority groups, etc.)	☐ 6	☐ 32	☐ 61
Intervention from outside sources	☐ 2	☐ 11	☐ 87
Lack of experience of some members on boards	☐ 5	☐ 40	☐ 55
Lack of understanding by some members as to how a board should function	☐ 8	☐ 36	☐ 56
Inadequacy of information and orientation materials provided board members with agenda prior to meetings	☐ 9	☐ 27	☐ 64
Devoting too much time to trivial rather than material matters	☐ 10	☐ 32	☐ 58
An "Open Meeting" Law or Practice	☐ 3	☐ 11	☐ 86
Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	

7. Please check any of the following that you feel would improve the functioning of your governing board:

- ☐ Increase in size 7
- ☐ Decrease in size 14
- ☐ Replacement of one or more members 38
- ☐ More attention to or concern with matters of major or long-range significance, including educational policy 52
- ☐ Better orientation of board members to the institution 40
- ☐ Better understanding by the board chairman of his role as chairman 12
- ☐ Improved board committee structure or functioning 28
- ☐ More systematic reporting by administrative officers and department chairmen on the status of their programs 28
- ☐ Greater contact with knowledgeable members of other boards 38
- ☐ More information about and understanding of trends in contemporary society 31
- ☐ Other (specify _____)

8. A "crisis" for a board may be defined as a situation of serious consequence for or threat to the institution or the functioning of the board, involving issues that are of persistent concern, and that requires unusual effort to resolve. What, if any, such "crisis" has the board experienced or dealt with in the last three years? If more than three, list only the most critical. And, how satisfied are you with the way the board handled (or is handling) these "crises"?

Nature of Crises	Rating of Board Handling			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
a. _____	☐ 36	☐ 38	☐ 16	☐ 10
b. _____	☐ 26	☐ 38	☐ 24	☐ 12
c. _____	☐ 25	☐ 38	☐ 26	☐ 11

9. Could handling of any of these crises by the board be improved in the future? If so, how?

_____

_____

III. The Effectiveness of Your Board

1. Below are listed some characteristics that describe different areas of board effectiveness. How would you rate your board *as a whole* on each?

	How do you rate your board			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
a. *Diversity:* The board as a whole contains the necessary diversity of talents, skills, experience, and interests among its members to complement one another and to strengthen the whole board.	☐ 42	☐ 42	☐ 14	☐ 2
b. *Structure:* The board is structured in such a way that individuals and/or committees assume a proper, active, and effective role in the operation and activities of the board.	☐ 30	☐ 44	☐ 20	☐ 5
c. *Member Involvement:* Members demonstrate a high degree of interest in the institution and in their role and responsibilities as trustees or regents; they are genuinely involved in the institution's problems and prospects.	☐ 36	☐ 41	☐ 20	☐ 3
d. *Knowledgeability:* The members of the board are well-informed about the institution, its place in the higher education system, and in the currents of society affecting higher education.	☐ 20	☐ 50	☐ 26	☐ 3
e. *Rapport:* The members of the board have mutual respect for each other, regardless of differences of opinion, and maintain an effective working relationship with each other.	☐ 59	☐ 35	☐ 5	☐ 1
f. *Sense of Priorities:* Board members, and the board as a body, tend to be concerned with important and long-range issues rather than with trivial matters.	☐ 33	☐ 46	☐ 18	☐ 3
g. *Direction:* The chairman is respected, strong, and skilled both in making certain that different points of view are expressed, and in obtaining satisfactory decisions.	☐ 48	☐ 35	☐ 14	☐ 3
h. *Sensitivity:* The board is representative of, or sensitive to, different constituencies and viewpoints.	☐ 30	☐ 50	☐ 18	☐ 2
i. *Strength:* The board is strong enough to achieve effective educational policy decisions in the face of extraneous political or other outside pressures.	☐ 41	☐ 44	☐ 13	☐ 2
j. *Financial Support:* The board contains a reasonable number of members who provide or help get financial support.	☐ 25	☐ 36	☐ 27	☐ 12
k. *Board/President Relationship:* There is an effective working relationship between the board and the president or chancellor and his staff.	☐ 63	☐ 26	☐ 8	☐ 2
l. *Accomplishment:* The board has a genuine sense of progress and achievement, and members derive satisfaction from their service.	☐ 43	☐ 43	☐ 12	☐ 2

2. What do you believe is the most outstanding *asset or strength* of your board as it is presently constituted and functions?

3. Conversely, what is its major *shortcoming or inadequacy?*

4. What do you consider the *general* effectiveness of the current board of this institution to be? (check one)
   - ☐ Clearly in the highest category for institutions of this type 48
   - ☐ Not of the highest order, but satisfactory 37
   - ☐ Less than completely satisfactory—at least in some respects—but adequate 11
   - ☐ In need of major change toward improvement of persistent problems 4

IV. **Informational Needs of Board Members**

1. How valuable would *additional* information be to you in each of the following areas?

	Extremely Valuable	Of Some Value	Of Limited Value
a. Good governance procedures in general	☐ 32	☐ 47	☐ 21
b. Curricular innovations in other institutions	☐ 37	☐ 49	☐ 13
c. Budgeting, financial planning, and maintenance practices	☐ 37	☐ 43	☐ 19
d. Fund raising	☐ 44	☐ 33	☐ 23
e. Trends in federal support of higher education	☐ 34	☐ 46	☐ 20
f. Trends in state support of higher education	☐ 38	☐ 42	☐ 20
g. High level manpower needs	☐ 20	☐ 49	☐ 31
h. Personnel management practices for faculty and administration	☐ 35	☐ 43	☐ 22
i. National trends in higher education	☐ 42	☐ 46	☐ 12
j. Legal challenges to board, and ways of coping with them	☐ 27	☐ 42	☐ 31
k. Problems similar institutions are facing, and what they are doing about them	☐ 61	☐ 35	☐ 4
l. Additional information from institutional sources on financial aspects: nature and extent of current indebtedness, proportion of operating costs coming from tuition, etc.	☐ 34	☐ 45	☐ 21
m. Additional information from institutional sources on such matters as proportion of faculty with tenure, proportion of minority students in student body, etc.	☐ 32	☐ 46	☐ 22
n. Other (specify _____)	☐	☐	☐

2. Toward improving board functioning, how promising or attractive would the following activities by a service organization appear to be in providing needed information or experience?

	Very attractive	Of some attractiveness	Of limited attractiveness
a. Workshops of introductory conferences to orient *new* trustees	☐ 43	☐ 33	☐ 24
b. Brief and to-the-point reports for trustees and presidents	☐ 48	☐ 41	☐ 11
c. Occasional forums for exchange of ideas and experience	☐ 35	☐ 49	☐ 16
d. One or more national and coordinated research programs to study and report facts affecting the trusteeship	☐ 20	☐ 44	☐ 36
e. Commissioned papers or think-pieces by outstanding presidents, trustees, or educational specialists	☐ 28	☐ 48	☐ 24
f. Suggested readings of special interest to trustees from current publications	☐ 29	☐ 53	☐ 18
g. Provision of specialized consultants on matters of concern to boards or presidents	☐ 26	☐ 46	☐ 28

h. Are there other activities that you feel a service organization like AGB could provide to improve the functioning of your board or president? If so, please comment:

_____

_____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM, WHEN COMPLETED, TO

AGB STUDY
RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE
P. O. BOX 12194
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, N. C. 27709

Sample President Questionnaire

STUDY OF EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNING BOARDS

Association of Governing Boards
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C.

1. 2 or less 17
3-4 33
5-8 12
9-12 28
13-20 4
21-25 5
26-30 0.5

I. The Structure of Your Governing Board

1. How many times a year does your board meet? _____

2. How would you characterize attendance of members at regular meetings over the last two years?
☐ Excellent 51 ☐ Generally good 48 ☐ Unsatisfactory 2

3. Do any committees of your board have non-board *members*? ☐ Yes 42 ☐ No 58
- Do any committees of your board meet regularly with college representatives who are not committee members? 71 ☐ Yes ☐ No 29
- Do you feel board committees *should* meet regularly with non-board members or other college representatives? 77 ☐ Yes ☐ No 23

4. (A) How *influential*, in your opinion, are each of the following factors in the *actual* selection or appointment of new trustees? (B) How important *should* each of the factors be?

	A Influence of Factors			B Importance of Factors		
	Of Central Influence	Of Moderate Influence	Of Minor or no Influence	Should be of Central Importance	Should be of Moderate Importance	Should be of Minor or No Importance
Advice or convictions of board chairman	☐ 29	☐ 40	☐ 31	☐ 26	☐ 56	☐ 18
Advice or convictions of board members	☐ 33	☐ 42	☐ 25	☐ 34	☐ 54	☐ 13
Advice or convictions of president	☐ 37	☐ 40	☐ 24	☐ 39	☐ 51	☐ 10
Community Stature	☐ 48	☐ 49	☐ 4	☐ 65	☐ 34	☐ 1
General leadership skills	☐ 35	☐ 52	☐ 12	☐ 73	☐ 26	☐ 1
Past affiliation with the institution	☐ 16	☐ 40	☐ 44	☐ 13	☐ 55	☐ 33
Knowledgeability on higher education issues	☐ 13	☐ 52	☐ 35	☐ 53	☐ 44	☐ 3
Representation of different constituencies	☐ 32	☐ 48	☐ 20	☐ 37	☐ 48	☐ 14
Competence in a professional specialty (e.g., law, accounting, etc.)	☐ 17	☐ 56	☐ 27	☐ 25	☐ 50	☐ 16
Fund raising capability	☐ 16	☐ 34	☐ 51	☐ 39	☐ 38	☐ 23
Other factors (specify)						
_____	☐ 64	☐ 27	☐ 9	☐ 36	☐ 16	☐ 48
_____	☐ 64	☐ 18	☐ 18	☐ 27	☐ 36	☐ 36

5. *Are* there limitations on the terms of service of trustees on your board? 68 ☐ Yes ☐ No 32
- If yes, what are the limitations? _____

6. *Should* there be limitations on the terms of service of trustees on your board? ☐ Yes 74 ☐ No 26 ☐ Uncertain 0

II. The Functioning of Your Board

1. To what extent do each of the factors listed generally operate in the decisionmaking process of your board?

	To a Considerable Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To Little or No Extent
a. Firm guidance by chairman	☐ 49	☐ 45	☐ 5
b. Recourse to expert opinion outside the board	☐ 14	☐ 57	☐ 29
c. Active and vigorous debate at board meetings	☐ 34	☐ 51	☐ 15
d. Strong guidance by committees or committee chairmen	☐ 57	☐ 27	☐ 17
e. Individual, private exchanges among two or more key members	☐ 23	☐ 47	☐ 30
f. Recommendations by institution's chief administrative officer	☐ 91	☐ 9	☐ 0
g. The simple pressure of the situation and the unavailability of alternative solutions	☐ 16	☐ 48	☐ 36
h. "Lobbying" by or pressures from extra-board groups-alumni, students, political bodies, etc.	☐ 2	☐ 28	☐ 70
i. Use by board of background information provided by the administration or other sources	☐ 78	☐ 20	☐ 2
j. Other (specify _____	☐ 57	☐ 43	☐

90

2. To what extent have the following *adversely* affected the functioning of the board in the last two years?

	To Little or No Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Considerable Extent
Board structure; i.e., functioning of committees	☐ 65	☐ 26	☐ 9
Leadership style of the board chairman	☐ 65	☐ 25	☐ 10
Failure by the president to achieve effective communication on some issue	☐ 69	☐ 27	☐ 4
Conflict between the board and the president	☐ 89	☐ 6	☐ 5
Difficulty in achieving resolution of a problem that is acceptable to all members	☐ 65	☐ 30	☐ 5
One of more obstructionist members	☐ 71	☐ 21	☐ 8
Strong and irreconcilable differences of opinion within the board	☐ 80	☐ 14	☐ 6
Failure of the board to accept and exercise its responsibility as a board	☐ 71	☐ 20	☐ 9
Tendency of the board to exceed its proper role	☐ 76	☐ 19	☐ 5
Absenteeism (from illness or other situation) of one or more members	☐ 74	☐ 24	☐ 3
Too much "dead wood" on the board	☐ 68	☐ 23	☐ 9
Challenges from special constituencies (i.e., students, faculty, alumni, minority groups, etc.)	☐ 73	☐ 25	☐ 2
Intervention from outside sources	☐ 82	☐ 15	☐ 4
Lack of experience by some members on boards	☐ 54	☐ 39	☐ 7
Lack of understanding by some members as to how a board should function	☐ 45	☐ 43	☐ 12
Failure of members to familarize themselves with information and orientation materials provided board members with agenda prior to meetings	☐ 54	☐ 37	☐ 8
Devoting too much time to trivial rather than material matters	☐ 55	☐ 35	☐ 10
An "Open Meeting" law or practice	☐ 83	☐ 11	☐ 6
Other (specify _____)			
_____	☐	☐	☐

3. How helpful have the members of your board been to you in each of the following areas?

	Very Helpful	Of Moderate Help	Of Little or No Help	Irrelevant
a. Providing personal support and sustaining friendship	☐ 74	☐ 20	☐ 4	☐ 2
b. Providing intelligent professional advice from own areas of competence or professional expertise	☐ 54	☐ 40	☐ 5	☐ 0.5
c. Providing firm policy decisions when these were needed	☐ 72	☐ 23	☐ 5	☐
d. Assisting in the interpreting of positions and policies with groups within or outside the institution when requested	☐ 30	☐ 57	☐ 10	☐ 3
e. Defending the institution against critics	☐ 41	☐ 46	☐ 6	☐ 6
f. Defending you against critics	☐ 43	☐ 33	☐ 11	☐ 12
g. Finding or achieving new sources of support for valued institutional goals	☐ 19	☐ 46	☐ 31	☐ 4

4. Does your institution have a long range plan projecting institutional goals? 81 ☐ Yes ☐ No 19

–If yes, how was the board principally involved in the development of this plan?

- ☐ By *formulating* and *deciding* on plan 7
- ☐ By *advising* on and *reviewing* plan 47
- ☐ By *approving* and *confirming* plan 46

–How satisfied are you with the reasonableness and attainability of the long-range plan?

- ☐ Quite satisfied 26
- ☐ Reasonably satisfied 56
- ☐ Somewhat concerned 13
- ☐ Quite concerned 5

5. Please check *any* of the following that you feel would improve the functioning of your governing board

- ☐ Increase in size 7
- ☐ Decrease in size 9
- ☐ Replacement of one or more members 60
- ☐ More attention to or concern with matters of major or long-range significance, including educational policy 59
- ☐ Better orientation of board members to the institution 37
- ☐ Better understanding by the board chairman of his role as chairman 19
- ☐ Improved board committee structure or functioning 34
- ☐ More systematic reporting by administrative officers and department chairmen on the status of their programs 23
- ☐ More information about and understanding of trends in contemporary society 34
- ☐ Other (specify _____)

6. What are the highest priorities for the improvement of the functioning of your board?

_____

_____

7. How important do you feel the following challenges facing governing boards of institutions like yours will be in the decade ahead?

	Of Great Importance	Of Some Importance	Of Limited or No Importance
New challenges in fiscal planning and policy	☐ 90	☐ 9	☐ 1
Changes in the structure of higher education	☐ 49	☐ 45	☐ 5
Legal challenges to board authority	☐ 24	☐ 44	☐ 32
Challenges from within the institution to board authority	☐ 18	☐ 39	☐ 43
New questions as to the proper role of the board	☐ 20	☐ 50	☐ 31
Meeting educational needs of special groups of new kinds of students	☐ 25	☐ 57	☐ 18
Increased state or federal interaction in institutional affairs	☐ 52	☐ 41	☐ 7
New demands from faculty	☐ 38	☐ 54	☐ 8
Meeting student needs for relevant and useful educational experiences	☐ 34	☐ 57	☐ 9
Productive involvement in community affairs	☐ 20	☐ 55	☐ 26
Achieving institutional changes that must take place if the institution is to survive	☐ 49	☐ 36	☐ 14
Changes in the composition or structure of the lay board—by inclusion of faculty, students, educational specialists, etc.	☐ 10	☐ 35	☐ 54

III. The Effectiveness of Your Board

1. Below are listed some characteristics that describe different areas of board effectiveness. How would you rate your board *as a whole* on each?

	How do you rate your board			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
a. *Diversity:* The board as a whole contains the necessary diversity of talents, skills, experience, and interests among its members to complement one another and to strengthen the whole board.	☐ 27	☐ 50	☐ 20	☐ 4
b. *Structure:* The board is structured in such a way that individuals and/or committees assume a proper, active, and effective role in the operation and activities of the board.	☐ 31	☐ 39	☐ 25	☐ 5
c. *Member Involvement:* Members demonstrate a high degree of interest in the institution and in their role and responsibilities as trustees or regents; they are genuinely involved in the institution's problems and prospects.	☐ 33	☐ 43	☐ 21	☐ 3
d. *Knowledgeability:* The members of the board are well-informed about the institution, its place in the higher education system, and in the currents of society affecting nigher education.	☐ 20	☐ 46	☐ 31	☐ 3
e. *Rapport:* The members of the board have mutual respect for each other, regardless of differences of opinion, and maintain an effective working relationship with each other.	☐ 56	☐ 34	☐ 7	☐ 3
f. *Sense of Priorities:* Board members, and the board as a body, tend to be concerned with important and long-range issues rather than with trivial matters.	☐ 29	☐ 42	☐ 24	☐ 5
g. *Direction:* The chairman is respected, strong, and skilled both in making certain that different points of view are expressed, and in obtaining satisfactory decisions.	☐ 49	☐ 32	☐ 16	☐ 2
h. *Sensitivity:* The board is representative of, or sensitive to, different constituencies and viewpoints.	☐ 34	☐ 49	☐ 16	☐ 1
i. *Strength:* The board is strong enough to achieve effective educational policy decisions in the face of extraneous political or other outside pressures.	☐ 40	☐ 46	☐ 11	☐ 3
j. *Financial Support:* The board contains a reasonable number of members who provide or help get financial support.	☐ 19	☐ 26	☐ 34	☐ 22
k. *Board/President Relationship:* There is an effective working relationship between the board and the president or chancellor and his staff.	☐ 68	☐ 26	☐ 4	☐ 2
l. *Accomplishment:* The board has a genuine sense of progress and achievement, and members derive satisfaction from their service.	☐ 46	☐ 40	☐ 13	☐ 1

2. What do you believe is the most outstanding *asset or strength* of your board as it is presently constituted and functions?

3. Conversely, what is its major *shortcoming or inadequacy?*

4. What do you consider the *general* effectiveness of the current board of this institution to be? (check one)
   - ☐ Clearly in the highest category for institutions of this type 46
   - ☐ Not of the highest order, but satisfactory 35
   - ☐ Less than completely satisfactory—at least in some respects—but adequate 15
   - ☐ In need of major change toward improvement of persistent problems 3

IV. Informational Needs of Your Board Members

1. In the light of the capacity and knowledgeability of your board, how valuable would *additional* information be to you and/or your board in each of the following areas?

	Extremely Valuable	Of Some Value	Of Limited Value
a. Good governance procedures in general	☐ 39	☐ 47	☐ 14
b. Curricular innovations in other institutions	☐ 27	☐ 48	☐ 26
c. Budgeting, financial planning, and maintenance practices	☐ 38	☐ 52	☐ 11
d. Fund raising	☐ 48	☐ 29	☐ 23
e. Trends in federal support of higher education	☐ 26	☐ 49	☐ 26
f. Trends in state support of higher education	☐ 33	☐ 47	☐ 21
g. High level manpower needs	☐ 16	☐ 50	☐ 34
h. Personnel management practices for faculty and administration	☐ 32	☐ 51	☐ 17
i. National trends in higher education	☐ 31	☐ 58	☐ 11
j. Legal challenges to board, and ways of coping with them	☐ 33	☐ 49	☐ 18
k. Problems similar institutions are facing, and what they are doing about them	☐ 58	☐ 36	☐ 6
l. Additional information from institutional sources on financial aspects: nature and extent of current indebtedness, proportion of operating costs coming from tuition, etc.	☐ 35	☐ 45	☐ 20
m. Additional information from institutional sources on such matters as proportion of faculty with tenure, proportion of minority students in student body, etc.	☐ 33	☐ 47	☐ 20
n. Other (specify _____)	☐	☐	☐

2. Toward improving board functioning, how promising or attractive do the following activities by an institution or a service organization appear to be in providing needed information or experience?

	Very attractive	Of some attractiveness	Of limited attractiveness
a. Workshops or introductory conferences to orient *new* trustees	☐ 35	☐ 48	☐ 18
b. Brief and to-the-point reports for trustees	☐ 66	☐ 31	☐ 2
c. Occasional forums for exchange of ideas and experience	☐ 41	☐ 51	☐ 9
d. One or more national and coordinated research programs to study and report problems affecting the trusteeship	☐ 16	☐ 51	☐ 33
e. Commissioned papers or think-pieces by outstanding presidents, trustees, or educational specialists	☐ 22	☐ 54	☐ 24
f. Suggested readings of special interest to trustees from current publications	☐ 26	☐ 53	☐ 21
g. Provision of specialized consultants on matters of concern to boards	☐ 25	☐ 44	☐ 30
h. Procedures for identifying prospective new trustees	☐ 28	☐ 37	☐ 35

i. Are there other activities that you feel a service organization like AGB could provide to improve the functioning of your board? If so, please comment:

_____

_____

_____

V. You and Your Institution

1. In what year were you designated as the president or chancellor of your institution? _____ Your age? _____ Your sex? _____

2. What was your position and type of institution immediately prior to your becoming president or chancellor of your current institution?

_____ (Position)

_____ (Type of Institution)

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM, WHEN COMPLETE TO:

AGB SURVEY
RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE
POST OFFICE BOX 12194
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NORTH CAROLINA 27709

V.1.	Before 1950	3	Year designated chancellor
	1950-1955	3	
	1956-1960	5	
	1961-1965	19	
	1966-1970	42	
	1970-Present	29	
1.	Below 30	1	Age
	30-35	2	
	36-40	6	
	41-45	14	
	46-50	25	
	51-55	25	
	56-60	18	
	61-65	5	
	66-70	2	
1.	Male	97	Sex
	Female	3	

Appendix C

Colleges and Universities, by Type and AGB Membership Status, Included in the Survey

PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES--54

Nonmember

1. Phillips County Community College AR
2. Westark Junior College*
3. Los Angeles Community College CA
4. Palo Verde Community College District CA
5. Cuesta College CA
6. Hartnell College CA
7. Santa Rosa Junior College CA
8. Solano County Community College CA
9. Peralta College District CA
10. Sierra College CA*
11. Los Rios Community College District CA
12. College of the Siskiyous CA
13. Tallahassee Community College FL
14. Pensacola Junior College FL
15. Elgin Community College IL*
16. Morton College IL
17. John A Logan College IL
18. Iowa Western Community College (Clarinda) IA
19. Eastern Iowa Community College District IA
20. Pratt Community Junior College KS
21. Lake Michigan College MI
22. Glen Oaks Community College MI
23. East Central Junior College MS*
24. Mineral Area College MO*
25. Trenton Junior College MO
26. Platte (Junior) College NE*

* Did not accept or decline, but was sent questionnaires in order to complete sample.

PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES--Nonmember--(continued)

27. Bergen Community College NJ
28. Westchester Community College NY
29. Adirondack Community College NY
30. Central Carolina Technical Institute NC*
31. Wilkes Community College NC*
32. Seminole Junior College OK*
33. Clatsop Community College OR*
34. Lane Community College OR
35. Dallas County Community College District TX
36. Panola College TX*
37. Howard County Junior College TX
38. Tacoma Community College WA
39. Ft. Steilacoom Community College WA
40. North Central Technical Institute WI
41. Nicolet College and Technical Institute WI
42. Charles County Community College MD
43. Dawson College MT
44. Germanna Community College VA
45. Laramie County Community College WY

Member

46. Moraine Valley Community College IL
47. Kalamazoo Valley Community College MI
48. Camden County College NJ
49. Mercer County Community College NJ
50. William Rainey Harper College IL
51. Junior College District of St. Louis MO
52. New Mexico Junior College NM
53. Cuyahoga Community College OH
54. Hillsborough Community College FL

PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES--30

Nonmember

55. Wesley College DE
56. Mallinckrodt College IL
57. Worcester Junior College MA
58. White Pines College NH
59. Louisburg College NC
60. Saint Mary's College NC
61. Peace College NC
62. Manor Junior College PA
63. Hiwassee College TN
64. Nairobi College CA*
65. Hartford College for Women CT
66. Mount Vernon College DC
67. Florida College FL*
68. Lincoln College IL*
69. Central College KS
70. Pine Manor Junior College MA
71. Natchez Junior College MS*
72. Bennett College NY
73. Trocaire College NY*
74. Bacone College OK
75. Peirce Junior College PA

Member

76. Union College NJ
77. Champlain College VT
78. Concordia Lutheran College TX
79. Bay Path Junior College MA
80. Simon's Rock MA
81. Mary Holmes Junior College MS
82. Tombrock College NJ
83. Jacksonville College TX*
84. Beckley College WV

PREDOMINANTLY BLACK PRIVATE COLLEGES--28

Nonmember

85. Miles College AL*
86. Morris Brown College GA
87. Selma University AL
88. Rust College MS

Member

89. Talladega College AL
90. Morehouse College GA
91. Atlanta University GA*
92. Dillard University LA*
93. Johnson C. Smith University NC
94. Wilberforce University OH
95. Bishop College TX
96. Wiley College*
97. Oakwood College AL
98. Bethune-Cookman College FL
99. Shaw University NC
100. Lane College TN
101. Tuskegee Institute AL
102. Howard University DC
103. Clark College GA
104. Spelman College GA
105. Tougaloo College MS
106. Bennett College NC
107. Lincoln University PA
108. Fisk University TN
109. Knoxville College TN
110. LeMoyne-Owen College TN
111. Hampton Institute VA
112. Xavier University of Louisiana LA

Nonmember

113. Arkansas College AR
114. Golden Gate College CA*
115. Kansas Wesleyan KS
116. Bethany College KS
117. Loyola College MD
118. School of the Ozarks MO*
119. Mount St. Mary College NY
120. Jamestown College ND
121. Ohio Northern University OH
122. Moravian College PA
123. Cabrini College PA
124. Roger Williams College RI
125. King College TN
126. Southwestern University TX*
127. Alderson-Broaddus College WV
128. Marian College of Fond du Lac WI
129. Williams College MA
130. Hastings College NE
131. Iona College NY
132. Greensboro College NC
133. Alliance College PA
134. Converse College SC
135. Hendrix College AR
136. Rollins College FL
137 Agnes Scott College GA
138. Oglethorpe College GA
139. Rockford College IL
140. MacMurray College IL
141. Goshen College IN
142. Wabash College IN
143. Goucher College MD
144. Amherst College MA

PRIVATE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES--(continued)

Member

145. Pitzer College CA
146. Duns Scotus College*
147. Olivet College MI*
148. Westminster College MO
149. College of New Rochelle NY
150. La Roche College PA
151. Columbia Union College MD
152. Antioch College OH
153. Pomona College CA
154. Pacific Union College CA
155. Colorado College CO
156. Connecticut College CT
157. Lake Forest College IL
158. Knox College IL
159. Grinnell College IA
160. Berea College KY
161. Bates College ME
162. Wheaton College MA
163. Saint Olaf College MN
164. Macalester College MN
165. Colgate University NY
166. Haverford College PA
167. Randolph-Macon College VA
168. Beloit College WI
169. Newberry College SC

Nonmember

170. University of Montevallo AL*
171. Florence State University AL
172. Henderson State College AR*
173. Morehead State University KY
174. Western Kentucky University KY
175. Oakland University, MI
176. Saginaw Valley College, MI
177. Central Missouri State College MO*
178. Northwest Missouri State College MO
179. Montclair State College NJ
180. Jersey City State College NJ
181. Trenton State College NJ
182. Western New Mexico University NM*
183. Millersville State College PA
184. Glassboro State College NJ

Member

185. Kentucky State University KY
186. Northern Michigan University MI
187. Northeast Missouri State University MO
188. New Mexico Highlands University NM
189. Eastern New Mexico University NM
190. Cleveland State University OH
191. Youngstown State University OH
192. Central State University OH*
193. Wright State University OH
194. Clarion State College PA
195. Edinboro State College PA
196. Lock Haven State College PA
197. East Stroudsburg State College PA
198. Cheyney State College PA

STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES--Member--(continued)

199. The Citadel SC
200. Midwestern University TX
201. Madison College VA
202. Virginia State College VA
203. Central Washington State College WA
204. Delaware State College DE
205. Murray State University KY
206. Shippensburg State College PA
207. South Carolina State College SC
208. Radford College VA
209. Western Washington State College WA
210. Eastern Washington State College WA
211. Grand Valley State College MI
212. William Paterson College of New Jersey

PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES --37*

Nonmember

213. University of the Pacific GA
214. Brandeis University MA
215. Columbia University NY
216. Drew University NJ
217. University of Santa Clara CA
218. Drexel University PA
219. Carnegie-Mellon University PA
220. University of Southern California CA*
221. Dartmouth College NH
222. Fordham University NY
223. Emory University GA
224. Northwestern University IL
225. Harvard University MA
226. Tufts University MA
227. Boston University MA*
228. Cornell University NY
229. Wake Forest University NC
230. University of Tulsa OK
231. Brown University RI
232. Rice University TX

Member

233. Georgetown University DC
234. University of Dallas Tx
235. Duquesne University PA
236. Baylor University TX
237. Loyola University LA*
238. Princeton University NJ
239. American University DC
240. Texas Christian University TX*

*See footnote on page C-13 for additional institutions.

PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES--Member--(continued)

241. California Institute of Technology CA
242. George Washington University DC
243. University of Notre Dame IN
244. Clark University MA
245. Washington University MO
246. Adelphi University NY
247. Willamette University OR

LARGE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES--33

Nonmember

248. New Mexico State University NM
249. University of Cincinnati OH*

Member

250. Alabama Board of Trustees AL
251. University of Arkansas AR
252. University of Delaware DE
253. Southern Illinois University IL
254. Indiana University IN
255. Purdue University IN
256. University of Kentucky KY
257. University of Maryland MD
258. Wayne State University MI
259. Western Michigan University MI
260. University of Minnesota MN
261. University of New Mexico NM
262. Ohio State University OH
263. The University of Toledo OH
264. University of Akron OH
265. University of Pittsburgh PA
266. The Pennsylvania State University PA*
267. The University of Tennessee TN
268. The University of South Carolina SC
269. University of Houston TX
270. Texas Tech University TX
271. University of Virginia VA
272. Virginia Commonwealth University VA*
273. University of Washington WA
274. Auburn University AL
275. University of Illinois IL

LARGE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES--Member--(continued)

276. University of Michigan MI
277. University of Missouri MO
278. City University of New York NY
279. Indiana University of Pennsylvania PA
280. College of William and Mary VA

The report of the survey indicates (Table 2, p. 7) that 282 institutions were surveyed. After initial mailing, two other institutions, both private universities, expressed an interest in participating and were added. These were:

281. Stanford University
282. Yale University